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ABSTRACT

INNOVATION AND DIFFERENCE:
city planning in Adelaide from 1972 until 1993 within the historical framework of the politics of City/State relations from 1836.

This thesis is about the successful integration of strategic and statutory planning for the City of Adelaide during the period 1972 until 1993. It is a historical perspective of the City from the founding of Adelaide and South Australia in 1836 and their development until 1972; and then on the politics of planning in the City from October 1972 until December 1993. There are four themes in this thesis. In addition to the theme of integration, I will argue that the heritage of the City arising from Colonel Light’s Plan in 1836, particularly the Park Lands, made Adelaide different from the other capital cities in Australia. Through the influence of key individuals there was a particular relationship and balance of power between the City and State in terms of their respective power and the governance of the City. I will argue that in the 1960s the policies of the Council and the statutory provisions of the State’s Metropolitan Development Plan contributed to a considerable loss of residential population from the City. These issues provided reasons for major reform in 1972 when an innovative system of Interim Development Control was introduced and a Planning Study of the City subsequently carried out. After agreement between the City and the State an innovative and different legislative approach to city planning in an Australian capital city was introduced. I will argue that this legislation, which provided for a joint City/State planning authority for Adelaide, enabled critical political decisions to be made which facilitated the re-establishment of an inner city residential population. But it also maintained the City’s role and function as the centre of the metropolitan area. I will also argue that planning legislation specifically for the City in 1977 was important as it not only provided for the continuation of a joint City/State authority, but also for five-yearly City Plans within which strategic and statutory approaches to city planning were integrated. This situation continued until 1993 when after a State Planning Review the separate legislation was repealed for political and technical reasons. Thus, after twenty-one years of innovation and difference in the City of Adelaide, a new State planning system was introduced partially modelled on the approach taken in the City.
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PART ONE

CHAPTER 1.1

Introduction

1.1.1 BACKGROUND

In Scene I of Act III of William Shakespeare’s play Coriolanus, Sicinius asks:

“What is the City but the people?”

and the citizens reply:

“True, the people are the City”.¹

I come from a long line of Welsh Methodist Ministers which meant going to Chapel in the valleys twice every Sunday for services. At the beginning of his sermon my father would provide a text for the congregation to focus on while he was preaching. But before starting his sermon he would repeat the text for emphasis. And thus, “What is the City but the people?” “True, the people are the City”.

There are four themes in this thesis. The first theme is the heritage of the City arising from Colonel Light’s original plan in 1836 which made Adelaide different from the other capital cities in Australia. Through the influence of key individuals, which is the second theme, there was a particular relationship and balance of power between the City and State in terms of their respective power and the governance of the City which is the third theme. In the 1960s the policies of the Council and the statutory provisions of the State’s Metropolitan Development Plan contributed to a considerable loss of residential population from the City. These issues provided reasons for major reform in 1972 when an innovative and different legislative approach to the integration of strategic and statutory planning of an Australian capital city was introduced and this is the fourth theme.

The thesis is a historical perspective of Adelaide from the founding of the City and Province in 1836 and their development until 1972 but focusing in particular on the politics of strategic and statutory planning in the City during the period from October 1972 until December 1993.

¹ It is believed that Coriolanus was first performed in 1607 but the play was not available in print until 1623 when John Hemminges and Henry Condell published the First Folio of Shakespeare’s work in London.
A map of the present City of Adelaide is shown in Figure 1 which indicates North Adelaide and South Adelaide encircled by the Park Lands and the suburbs outside.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 17 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 1 – Map of the present City of Adelaide
Source: Gregory’s Adelaide Street Directory 2009, p.15

I will argue that in the 1960s the policies of the Council and the statutory provisions of the State’s Metropolitan Development Plan contributed to a considerable loss of residential population from the City. Alexander (1974, p.159) asserts the decline of central area population was a world wide trend justified by economic competition from more viable uses. In Adelaide these issues provided reasons for major reform in 1972 when an innovative system of Interim Development Control was introduced and a Planning Study of the City subsequently carried out.

I will argue that after agreement between the City and the State an innovative and different legislative approach to city planning in an Australian capital city was introduced. This legislation provided for a joint City/State planning authority for Adelaide which enabled critical political decisions to be made which facilitated the re-establishment of an inner city residential population but it also maintained the City’s role and function as the centre of the metropolitan area.

2 The population of the City at the end of WWII was in excess of 40,000 but by 1972 it had declined to 11,896 (Source: Adelaide City Council).
I will argue that planning and development control legislation specifically for the City in 1977 provided a benchmark for Australia as there was a continuation of a joint City/State authority and five-yearly City Plans within which strategic and statutory approaches to city planning were integrated.

I will argue that this situation continued until 1993 when, after a State Planning Review, the separate legislation was repealed for political and technical reasons and a new State planning system was introduced which incorporated parts of the approach taken in the City into contemporary SA planning legislation and frameworks.

An argument is launched that these factors collectively contributed to the evolution of an innovative and different system of planning and development control in the City of Adelaide during the period October 1972 until December 1993, and this is the realm of my thesis.

1.1.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

In this Section the historical context of Adelaide and South Australia is examined. From the earliest days of the settlement of the ‘Province of South Australia’, as it was first expressed, there was controversy between the City, as represented by its surveyor and founder Colonel William Light and the State, as represented by the first resident Governor, Captain John Hindmarsh RN. The issue was the site of the new City. Colonel Light had the ultimate responsibility for the decision as vested in him by the Colonisation Commissioners but he had to take into account the views of the Governor. Light chose a site geographically situated in the middle of the Adelaide plain and placed the northern and southern parts of the City either side of a river (Dutton, 1960; Elder, 1984; Cheesman, 1986). The Province had been proclaimed on 28 December 1836 and Colonel Light started laying out the City, including its design of six squares and surrounded by a continuous belt of Park Lands, in February 1837 (Dutton, 1960; Elder 1984; Cheesman, 1986; Hutchings & Bunker, 1986).

In terms of relevant legislation for the City and the State, the South Australia Colonisation Act, 1834 established the Province of South Australia. It was assented to on 15 August 1834 and enacted on 19 February 1836. The Municipal Act, 1840, established the City of Adelaide and provided for an elected Council which made Adelaide the second oldest municipality (after Toronto in Canada) in the British Commonwealth outside of Britain itself. The first Parliament of South Australia, after direct rule
by the Governor, came into existence in 1857 and so democracy in the City preceded democracy in
the Colony, initially founded as a ‘Province’, by 13 years.

The Adelaide Club was established in 1868 by businessmen and pastoralists who had profited from
the early years of rapid growth (Fischer & Seamark, 2005). From the early 19th century there were
interlocking directorships of company boards and gentlemen of “establishment” families, such as the
Angas’, Barr Smiths’, Bonythons’, Elders’, Morphetts’, Seppelts’ and Rymills’, were members of the
Members of the Club were often elected to the Adelaide City Council (the ‘Council’) as well as to
Upper House of the Parliament of South Australia, the Legislative Council. Property ownership
became a key factor in the development of the City and the Province because it determined who was
eligible to vote. Adelaide was effectively a City/State and a small group of people controlled the
money and made all the important decisions (Sandercock, 1975a; Linn, 2006). Indeed, Fischer &
Seamark (2005) assert that more decisions affecting the development of South Australia were made
in the Club than in Parliament.

The Adelaide City Council was therefore able to exercise considerable influence on Colonial and then
State matters because some of its members were also members of the Legislative Council from the
late 19th century through to the 1980s. There are numerous examples where the Council was able to
have itself excluded from legislation which applied to the rest of the Colony (later the State), or
enabled the insertion of clauses in other State legislation which only applied to the City.3

The late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed considerable public concern in North America, Britain and
Australia with the outcomes of end-state statutory planning (“Master Plans”) without any public
participation, the building of freeways, issues arising from the significant growth in the use of the
motor car, the removal of “slums” and their replacement with high rise development, and the
demolition of heritage buildings (Goodman, 1972; Friedmann, 1981; Marmot, 1982; Dakin, 1993;
Altshuler, 1996; Gold, 1997; Ward, 2004). In the City of Sydney there was significant public reaction
to high rise redevelopment schemes proposed for the areas of The Rocks and Woolloomooloo and
“Green Bans” on development were imposed by the Builders Labourers’ Federation (BLF) of New

3 See, for example, the Town Planning Act, 1920, the Local Government Act, 1934 and the Highways Act, 1956.
In the early 1970s the Civic Reform Association came to power on the Sydney City Council with a platform of preparing a new plan for the City of Sydney. George Clarke and his Urban Systems Corporation Pty. Ltd. were engaged and the first strategic plan in Australia, the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan 1971*, was adopted (Sydney City Council, 1971). The Plan involved a performance-based approach to managing the City with Objectives and Policies designed to address the gaps left by the traditional statutory planning scheme.4

In the City of Adelaide there was widespread public reaction to the technocratic *Metropolitan Area Transportation Study* (MATS) which proposed some 130 kilometres of new freeways and the upgrading of the arterial road network (Government of South Australia, 1962). There was also considerable public opposition to a comprehensive redevelopment scheme proposed for the inner suburb of Hackney (Pugh, 1973; Warburton, 1986). Within the City itself, the Adelaide City Council was pursuing a policy of new car parking station construction with a new north-south main road proposal (on the Frome Street alignment) in the eastern side of the City. To implement this, the Council was actively buying properties in North Adelaide and South Adelaide to join Main North Road in the north-east to Glen Osmond Road in the south-east. This resulted in Hugh Stretton (1970, 1976, 1978, 2005) becoming very interested in urban issues (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 9:16, North Adelaide, 11 April 2007; Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 32:37, Dulwich, 24 April 2007). In particular, the publication of *Ideas for Australian Cities* (Stretton, 1970) had a significant influence upon the then State Labor Premier Don Dunstan, MLA member for Norwood, an electorate experiencing gentrification, and the then Lord Mayor Bill Hayes.

Dunstan became very concerned about a city administration dominated by an engineering approach to transportation policies and what was happening socially in the City, particularly the loss of residential population (P Ward 2007, pers. comm., 7 July). The transportation policies of the Council were unpopular and led directly to the formation of Residents' Societies.5 The statutory planning scheme imposed by the State Government, which zoned the whole of South Adelaide for commercial uses, had directly contributed to the loss of the City's residential population. With the agreement of the newly elected reformist Lord Mayor Hayes in 1971, Dunstan was able to impose innovative Interim Development Control powers on the City in October 1972 through an amendment to the *Planning and Development Act, 1968*. A joint City/State body – the City of Adelaide Development

---

4 The statutory *Cumberland County Planning Scheme* applied to the City.
5 The North Adelaide Society Incorporated and the Adelaide Residents' Association were formed as a direct result of these unpopular Council policies.
Committee (CADC) – administered this specially enacted legislation. The Adelaide City Council resolved to carry out a planning study of the City and called for expressions of interest on an international basis. Seven firms were recommended for interview by the administration from the 25 submissions received and the Council interviewed four. The consulting firm Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd was appointed in 1973 to carry out the planning study, with George Clarke as the Project Director, primarily based on their experience in Sydney.

There was a considerable amount of public participation involved in the planning process and the consultant’s recommendations were received by the Adelaide City Council in June 1974. Rather than building on the statutory scheme which had been the case in the City of Sydney, a whole new approach was taken with a proposal for a separate Act just for the City of Adelaide. After further public consultation and intense negotiations between the State and the City, it was agreed that there would be separate legislation for a system of development control. But the “planning” of the City did not need legislation and would continue as it always had – by the decisions of governments, semi-government and private organizations and individuals (Mant & Llewellyn-Smith, 1978). The Interim Development Control powers ceased on 28 February 1977 and the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 came into effect on 1 March 1977. In parallel, the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1976) was adopted as the Council’s first strategic policy document accompanied with a commitment to a process of review and the adoption of a new Plan on a five-yearly cycle. An important element of the new legislation was the continuation of a joint City/State body and establishment of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission (CAPC) comprised of four Government and four Council representatives. A reserve power was provided for the State, and the CAPC was required to liaise with the Commonwealth Government and the Adelaide City Council to formulate a comprehensive understanding of government policies and programs as they affected the City. This system of co-operation and subsequent five-yearly City Plans (1981-86; 1986-91; and 1991-96) continued until 1993. After a State Planning Review established by Premier Bannon in 1992, the Labor State Government under Premier Arnold in 1993 decided to abolish the separate system and reintegrate the City into the overall State system. The City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 was repealed and the new Development Act, 1993 came into force.

As will be expanded below, there are several key reasons why the City was able to have its own planning and development control legislation for the 21 years from 1972 until 1993, first as a specific

---

6 See Appendix 1.
amendment to the *Planning and Development Act, 1968* and then through the operation of the City-specific *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976* which continued until it was repealed in 1993.

1.1.3 WHY THIS RESEARCH? RATIONALE

The reason for this research is addressed in this Section. Given the above, it is argued that the nature and role of the City of Adelaide, within the context of the State, has dominated the political debate between the two levels of government since Light’s decision to site the City where he did rather than where Hindmarsh wanted it.

As the author of this dissertation, and as a professional planning practitioner and former local government Chief Executive Officer, I have always held the view that planning is primarily a political, not a technical, process. Bolan (1975, pp. 499–513) considered that the traditional view of urban planning which was to analyse, develop alternatives and evaluate the consequences of each, needed to change to take into account the political climate in which it functioned. Urban planning was not just a technical process but one where choices were made having regard to the politics of the decision-making environment. Allmendinger (2009, p.171) states it is a myth that planners advise and politicians decide as planning is essentially a political activity rife with value judgements. Freestone (2010, p.3) also asserts planning is a highly political activity with key decisions being made by elected representatives having regard to professional advice. Versteeg & Hajer (2010, p.160) argue that it is not whether the planning process is political, but how politics manifests itself within the process.

Political considerations determined the growth of metropolitan Adelaide and the development of the City (Bunker 1971, 1983; Hutchings & Garnaut, 2009). The years 1972 to 1993 were unique in the history of the City of Adelaide in that the City had its own planning and development control legislation separate from the rest of the State. Little has been written about this period in the City’s history and the relationship between the City and the State has not been researched, particularly in terms of the people who were influential and what decisions were made.

The relevant planning documents are the *City of Adelaide Planning Study* (Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd, 1974), the *City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81* (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1977), the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976*, the *Principles of Development Control*
within the City of Adelaide (Government of South Australia, 1976), the City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86 (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1981), the City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91 (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1986), Urban Design in the City of Adelaide (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1988), the City of Adelaide Plan 1991-96 (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1992) and the State Planning Review’s 20/20 vision: a planning system (Government of South Australia, 1992). I had no firsthand knowledge of the period October 1972 until August 1974 but I was employed by the Adelaide City Council as the City Planner from September 1974 until December 1981 and then as the Town Clerk/Chief Executive Officer from January 1982 until June 1994. As the author of this dissertation I perceive that I therefore have a good personal knowledge of the people who were influential and the events that were important for 19 years of the 21 year period that this thesis covers. I recognise, nonetheless, that a bias may exist in this perception so have cast research and interview process in this dissertation wider than originally conceived to delimit and reflect upon any personal bias.

1.1.4 FOCUSSING THE TOPIC OF INQUIRY

The topic of inquiry is given focus in this Section. The initial topic title for the thesis was envisaged as “Strategic Planning in the City of Adelaide 1969 – 1994: 25 years of difference”. Erroneously, I had assumed that the powers of Interim Development Control had been initially introduced in 1969. The State’s Development Act, 1993 had come into operation on 15 January 1994 and so it was considered the 25 years from 1969 to 1994 would be an appropriate period of time for the research to address. However, early research established that the formal imposition of the Interim Development Control was actually in October 1972, although discussions between Premier Dunstan and Lord Mayor Hayes had commenced in late 1971 (P Ward 2007, pers. comm., 7 July). This was confirmed by Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 68:70, St. Peters, 16 April 2007) and Roche (Roche, John, ohi 4 / 21:23, North Adelaide, 17 April 2007). The operation of this separate or dual system ceased in December 1993. Accordingly, the topic title was amended to “Strategic Planning in the City of Adelaide 1972-1993: 21 years of difference”. During the course of conducting 47 interviews from a potential list of 65 interviewees, it became clear that the topic really was not about “Strategic Planning” as such, but rather about the importance of the influence of individuals in the City and State and the roles that they had played. The perspective also became an historical one with the politics of planning in the City between two levels of government giving rise to the further themes of heritage

---

7 The Development Act, 1993 was passed by the State Parliament in December 1993.
and governance. The joint City/State bodies – the City of Adelaide Development Committee and then the City of Adelaide Planning Commission; the City of Adelaide Planning Study (Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd, 1974); the separate legislation for the City in 1976, the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976; and then the successive five-yearly City Plans, were all quite different from planning occurring elsewhere in Australia at the time and were innovative in their own right. The relationship between strategic and statutory planning in Adelaide provided the fourth theme of integration.

The topic title for the thesis therefore became:

**INNOVATION AND DIFFERENCE:**

City planning in Adelaide from 1972 until 1993 within the historical framework of the politics of City/State relations from 1836

1.1.5 THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The initial research questions sought to identify and interview the people who were influential in the events and the development of legislation both prior to 1972 and then for the next 21 years of the City’s separate planning and development control legislation. These questions were refined as the research work progressed and evolved to reflect the thesis being an historical critique on politics and process of strategic and statutory planning in the City during the period 1972 to 1993. The thesis therefore aims to address the following core questions:

In general, why was the City of Adelaide able to have an innovative and different approach to city planning and development control from 1972 until 1993?

In particular, what were the important factors in the introduction of Interim Development Control for the City in October 1972; in the operation of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 from March 1977; and in the repeal of this legislation in December 1993 when Adelaide was integrated into a new State system partially based on the City’s approach?

1.1.6 THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER: PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE

My role needs to be identified in terms of my background, biases and values (Creswell, 2009) and is described in this Section. Stretton (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 68:70, North Adelaide, 10 May 2007) observes:

You cannot do social science research of any kind without the use of values, it cannot be value free. But you do not need to surrender to other people’s values.
I have academic and professional qualifications in the fields of architecture, town planning and city management. I worked for the architectural firm McConnell, Smith & Johnson during 1971 which was part of a consortium with Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd and W D Scott and Company Pty Ltd. This consortium prepared the first strategic plan in Australia for Sydney – the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan* (Sydney City Council, 1971) with George Clarke as the Project Director. I was then appointed as the first Chief Planning Officer for the Council of the City of Sydney in January 1972 with responsibility for managing and implementing the Council’s Action Planning Programme. Clarke’s *City of Adelaide Planning Study* (Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd, 1974) was based upon the strategic plan preparation approach from Sydney but introduced an innovative concept of managing the City’s areas based upon Statements of Desired Future Character for each Precinct. In addition, rather than recommending an amendment to the existing statutory scheme, separate State legislation to authorise a new Plan for the City was proposed by the consultant, George Clarke.

In early 1974 as the planning study progressed the Adelaide City Council decided to split the town planning function from the City Engineer’s Department and establish a separate Department of City Planning with a new position of City Planner (Clampett, Bob, ohi 9 / 32:33, Mount Barker, 30 April 2007). By this time I was serving as the Deputy City Planner for the Council of the City of Sydney and Chair of the Woolloomooloo Steering Committee. In 1974 the Action Plan for Woolloomooloo was the first intra-governmental agreement in Australia between the three levels of government, Commonwealth, State and Local, to tackle urban problems. I was strongly encouraged by Clarke to apply for the position of Adelaide City Planner based on my experience in Sydney with strategic planning and managing Action Plans, especially Woolloomooloo.

My application was successful and I was appointed as the new Adelaide City Planner in April 1974. But, after negotiations between the Lord Mayor Shehadie of Sydney and Lord Mayor Clampett of Adelaide, I did not formally take up the position until September 1974 so that I could complete the Woolloomooloo Action Plan in Sydney. My main task at Adelaide was to establish the new Department of City Planning and to advise the Council about working with the State Government to convert the consultants’ *City of Adelaide Planning Study* (Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd, 1974) into a strategic City Plan for Adelaide. Much negotiation occurred between the political and administrative arms of the City and the State as part of this process. John Roche, who had significant property holdings in the city, had become Lord Mayor in March 1975 and, despite party political

---

8 The statutory scheme covering the City at the time was the *Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan, 1962.*
differences, he worked very closely with the Minister for Planning in the Dunstan Labor Government, the Hon. Hugh Hudson MP.

John Mant had arrived in Adelaide as an advisor to Minister Hudson early in 1976 after the Whitlam Labor Commonwealth Government had been dismissed in November 1975. Mant and I directly liaised at the administrative level in the State and the City over many months. The Council wanted separate legislation to authorise the whole of the proposed City of Adelaide Plan which had emerged in 1975 from the Planning Study. But the State Government was opposed to legislation which would authorise a plan specifically for the City containing proposals for significant expenditure by the State, especially in the area of transport improvements. A significant and far reaching decision emerged in the City of Adelaide during the period under review. This was to separate those elements of the proposed City Plan which needed to be legislated for (statutory development controls), and those which were of a strategic and policy nature which did not need legislation and would be subject to ongoing discussions and negotiations between the City and the State. Thus a conscious distinction was made between the policy and strategic role of planning authorities (both State and Local) and their separate statutory role of assessing development applications which should be objective and technical without political overtones.

The fruition of this successful split in functions led to the establishment of two State-level separate bodies under the Development Act, 1993 - the Development Assessment Commission (DAC) and the Development Policy Advisory Committee (DPAC) when the City’s separate legislation was repealed.

In July 1976 agreement had been reached between the City and the State on the statutory development controls. The ‘Principles of Development Control within the City of Adelaide’ (Government of South Australia, 1976) were jointly signed by Lord Mayor Roche and Minister Hudson. While the Dunstan Labor Government controlled the Lower House, the Lord Mayor on behalf of the Council still had influence in the Legislative Council thereby enabling successful passage of the legislation through the State Parliament. The innovative City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 was enacted on 1 March 1977.

This Act created a joint City/State body, the City of Adelaide Planning Commission (CAPC), as a successor to the City of Adelaide Development Committee (CADC). In contrast to the CADC membership of seven (four from the Council and three from the Government) there were four Council and four Government nominees. The reserve power lay with the State Government through the
Minister responsible for planning should there be a tied vote. Mant was appointed as one of the four State Commissioners and I was appointed as one of the four City Commissioners. The protocol of the Lord Mayor of the day being the Chairman was continued.9 A system of five-yearly City Plans (1976-81; 1981-86; 1986-91 and 1991-96) was established with a review process in years four and five of the respective plan leading to the adoption of the next plan. Consequential amendments were then made to the State legislative arrangements to reflect the policies in the new City Plan. However, there was an integration of the distinct strategic and statutory elements in the one document which was the City Plan.

The State Director of Planning, Stuart Hart, and the State Planning Authority (SPA) had been strongly opposed to separate legislation for the City in 1976 (Hart, Stuart, ohi 5 / 50:62, Springfield, 18 April 2007). The SPA actively sought to bring the City back into the overall state system without success because the Council was able to maintain its independence through influence at a political level with the State Government. My tenure as City Planner and a Commissioner ceased in December 1981 after I had managed the review and implementation of the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1976) and the adoption of the City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86 (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1982). On 1 January 1982 I became the Town Clerk/Chief Executive Officer of the Adelaide City Council. In this role I accompanied the Lord Mayor to monthly meetings with the Premier and the Head of the Department of Premier and Cabinet.10 Issues between the City and the State, especially in the planning field, were discussed, negotiated and resolved in this forum which is an important aspect in understanding and studying governance relevant to this dissertation. However, these meetings ceased in 1992 when the then Lord Mayor, Steve Condous, was selected as the Liberal candidate for the State seat of Colton and the then State Labor Premier, John Bannon, indicated it would be inappropriate for him to continue meeting with the Lord Mayor as he could not be sure which role Condous would be playing (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 84:93, Adelaide, 5 February 2008).

There were significant changes to the economic and political environment of the State in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Premier Bannon established a major review of the whole of the state planning system, including the City, in 1992. The Premier appointed me as an independent member of the Reference Group for the review and not as a representative of the Adelaide City Council. The State Government did not see the need for separate representation from the City as the Local Government Association of South Australia had a representative on the Reference Group. Arising

9 See the State Government Gazette 22 February 1977 for the eight appointments to the CAPC.
10 These meetings commenced early in 1982 between Liberal Premier David Tonkin and Lord Mayor John Watson.
from this review, a series of recommended actions resulted in the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976*, being repealed and a new *Development Act, 1993*, being passed by the State Parliament. This occurred for a number of reasons, one of which was that the Council had lost its influence in the Legislative Council. Thus, after 21 years of an independent, innovative and different system of planning and development control the City was reintegrated within the State system in December 1993. A few months later, on 30 June 1994, my tenure as the Town Clerk/Chief Executive Officer of the City of Adelaide ceased. I was then appointed by the State Government as the Deputy Presiding Member, and subsequently the Presiding Member, of the Development Assessment Commission (DAC) until I retired in June 2007.

My own involvement in the events and politics of the governance of the City from 1974 until 1993 will be described in Chapter 3.2 of this thesis but henceforth I will use the term “the researcher”.

1.1.7 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

The thesis is structured with four parts as described in this Section. A timeline for the thesis is shown diagrammatically in Figure 2 (p.15).

PART ONE contains this Introduction and Chapters on the Research Methodology (1.2), Literature Review – Theory and Adelaide (1.3), and Literature Review – Theory and Context (1.4). This includes an examination of governance both internationally and in the Australian capital cities (except Adelaide) as the context for the exercise of planning functions between a city and its respective upper level of government. The work by George Clarke in Sydney, which was critical for his later work in Adelaide, is described. There are numbered Sections within each Chapter of the thesis.

PART TWO provides a background and context for the relationship between the City and the State from 1836 until 1972. Chapter 2.1 describes the historical context of Adelaide and South Australia. The development of the City and State and their relationship from 1840 until the 1950s against a background of Town Planning and the Garden City Movement is discussed in Chapter 2.2. Changing attitudes to city planning in the City and State from the 1950 until 1972 within the broader international context is then discussed in Chapter 2.3.
PART THREE is about the politics of strategic and statutory planning in the City of Adelaide from October 1972 to December 1993 and the people who had influence in the City and the State. During this period the City had an innovative and different system of planning and development control independent from the rest of the State.

**Figure 2** - Diagrammatical representation of the thesis  
Source: Researcher
Chapter 3.1 describes the factors leading to the introduction of Interim Development Control in the City in 1972 and its operation through the City of Adelaide Development Committee (CADC) until February 1977. The *City of Adelaide Planning Study* (Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd, 1974), popularly known as “The Red Book” because of the colour of its cover, is discussed. The politics of the transition from the Study to the *City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81* (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1977), popularly known as “The Blue Book” is analysed. The importance of separating the strategic from the statutory elements but their integration within the City Plan as one document is examined.

Chapter 3.2 addresses the period from the introduction of the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976* on 1 March 1977 until the election of a State Labor Government in November 1982. Aspects of governance arising from a State Liberal Government being in power for three years from 1979 are examined. The beginning of a heritage study of the City is reviewed. Issues arising from the review of the first City Plan are analysed leading to the adoption of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1981-1986* (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1981), popularly known as “The Green Book”.

The period from November 1982, when Bannon was elected as Premier, until May 1987, is addressed in Chapter 3.3. The implications of controversy between the Council and the State over projects in the City are examined and analysed. The importance of the appointment of a high level political City/State review committee for the next City Plan is examined in terms of governance. The adoption of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1986–1991* (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1986), popularly known as “The Grey Book”, with a new emphasis on heritage and urban design is reviewed.

The final period from May 1987, when Condous was elected as Lord Mayor, until December 1993 when the City’s separate planning system ceased with the introduction of the *Development Act, 1993*, is reviewed in Chapter 3.4. The importance of the State Planning Review and the issue of Townscape are examined. The adoption of the last City Plan, the *City of Adelaide Plan 1991–1996* (Corporation of the City of Adelaide, 1992), popularly known as “The White Book”, is also described.

PART FOUR contains a Chapter on Conclusions and includes the References and Appendices. Within the Conclusions possible future research questions arising from this research are suggested.
1.1.8 SUMMARY AND AIM OF THE THESIS

This Section provides a summary and states the aim of the thesis. The Introduction has sought to provide a background for the thesis and to place it in an historical and political context from 1836. Reasons are given as to why this research needed to be carried out and its rationale. How the topic of inquiry was focused was described and the core research questions were identified. The role of the researcher was discussed. The structure of the thesis was explained.

The information obtained from the 47 personal oral history interviews with people who were key players during the period under review is not available in State or Local Government publications or other official records, or from media reports of the time.

It is hoped that this dissertation and its topic, which is unique to the City of Adelaide, will make an important and original contribution to the field of knowledge of strategic and statutory city planning and governance in the Australian and international context and this is the aim of the thesis.
Chapter 1.2

Research Methodology

1.2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter the research methodology used for the thesis will be described in terms of the approach taken; how the data was collected and analysed, and the themes that emerged.

1.2.2 THE RESEARCH APPROACH USED

In this Section the approach used to the research is described. Creswell states the three forms of research inquiry are qualitative, mixed method and quantitative (Creswell 2009). Approaches to qualitative research and the interpretation of data are described by Glaser & Strauss (1967), Barzun & Graff (1985), Strauss & Corbin (1990), Ely (1991), Connole, Smith & Wiseman (1993), Silverman (1993), Newman (1994), Bryant & Charmaz (2007) and Creswell (2009). Patton (2002, p.341) states:

Qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable and able to be made explicit.

Mixed method research methodology combines the best level of integration between different elements (Groat & Wang 2002, p.387). Brewer & Hunter (1989, p.45) assert that a mixed method approach allows the researcher to deal with disparities in the types of data (primary interview data and secondary published data). The elements in this thesis are:

- Qualitative - inquiry through personal interviews
- Interpretive - an historical review and analysis of documents

1.2.3 THE CITY OF ADELAIDE AS THE FOCUS OF THIS INVESTIGATION

The City of Adelaide is the focus of this investigation. This provides a strong platform upon which to undertake a considered analysis of state-local central-city planning relationships that underpin planning in Adelaide and directly influences, and has historically influenced, planning theory and practice in South Australia. This research is about the situation which made the City different from the other capital cities of Australia regarding its relationship to its respective State Government and with
its innovative and different approach to planning and development control for the period 1972 until
1993 within the historical political context of City/State relations from 1836.

1.2.4 QUALITATIVE RESEARCH THROUGH PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

This Section describes the oral history interviews. When the researcher came to Adelaide in
September 1974 he became aware that there was a separate system of planning legislation for the
City administered by the City of Adelaide Development Committee (CADC) which was an unusual
joint City/State body. For the years 1974 until 1993 the researcher needs to acknowledge his
personal involvement in the events that took place and his knowledge of the key people who were
influential. The researcher was able to identify a list of 65 potential interviewees from this personal
knowledge.

An analysis of the 65 potential interviewees\textsuperscript{11} revealed that 14 were deceased, one was unable to be
traced, one was unable to be interviewed for medical reasons, one declined to be interviewed and
one was the researcher - a total of 18. This left 47 to be interviewed and these were carried out in
Adelaide, Sydney and Melbourne in the interviewees' respective homes or offices, and in three cases
in the Lounge of the Hyatt Hotel in Adelaide. The 47 interviewees are shown in Table 1 and the
information obtained from these interviews provided the primary qualitative research base for the
thesis. The seven groupings were devised on the following basis:

A. "Elder Statesmen" involved in some way in the introduction of Interim Development Control in
1972 (including three individuals who subsequently became Lord Mayor);
B. People now living in Sydney who had been relevant to the planning situations in Sydney and
Adelaide;
C. City of Adelaide Planning Study Team and City of Adelaide Development Committee Advisors;
D. Former Premiers and former Ministers responsible for the administration of planning legislation in
South Australia from 1972 to 1993;
E. Lord Mayors (and Chairmen of the City of Adelaide Development Committee/City of Adelaide
Planning Commission); and City Planners of the City of Adelaide;
F. State Chief Executives responsible for Planning, Senior Planners, and Secretaries of the CAPC;
G. Deputy Lord Mayors responsible for reviews of the City of Adelaide Plan; selected
Commissioners of the CAPC, and members of the State Planning Review.

\textsuperscript{11} See Appendix 2 for the complete list of 65 potential interviewees with their positions, roles and relevant dates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP A - &quot;Elder Statesmen&quot;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H (High) Stretton</td>
<td>Member CADC; Deputy Chair SAHT; Academic, Author, North Adelaide resident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JS (John) Chappel</td>
<td>Councillor; Alderman; Deputy Lord Mayor; Member CADC; Member CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. JVS (Jim) Bowen</td>
<td>Councillor; Alderman; Lord Mayor; Member CADC; Chairman CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. JJ (John) Roche</td>
<td>Councillor; Lord Mayor; Chairman CADC; Chairman CAPC (Deceased April 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SB (Stuart) Hart</td>
<td>Director of Planning; Member CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. J (John) Brine</td>
<td>Deputy Member CADC; Academic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DJ (John) Williams</td>
<td>Secretary CADC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. GC (Gilbert) Currie</td>
<td>Deputy City Planner and subsequently City Planner ACC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RW (Bob) Clampett</td>
<td>Lord Mayor; Chairman CADC (Deceased August 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. NJ (Newell) Platten</td>
<td>Chief Architect and Planner SAHT; Member CADC; Member CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. RD (Bob) Bakewell</td>
<td>Director Department of the Premier; Member CADC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP B - Interviewees based in Sydney</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. K (Kyrtyna) Luczak</td>
<td>Department of City Planning; widow of George Clarke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. N (Nicholas) Shehadie</td>
<td>Lord Mayor of Sydney, Member Woolloomooloo Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. W (Bill) Manos</td>
<td>Deputy Lord Mayor of Adelaide; Member CAPC; Chair 1986-91 City of Adelaide Plan Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. JH (John) Mant</td>
<td>Advisor to Minister Hudson; Director Urban Development; Member CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. D (Darrel) Conybear</td>
<td>Senior Planner Sydney and Adelaide Strategic Plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP C - City of Adelaide Planning Study Team and Advisors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. P (Peter) Hignett</td>
<td>Urban Systems Corporation Planning Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. GW (Geoff) Wagner</td>
<td>Principal Planner, Department of City Planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. SG (Sybella) Blencowe</td>
<td>Advisor to Bakewell and CADC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. M (Michael) Bowering</td>
<td>Legal advisor to CADC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP D - Former Premiers and Ministers responsible for the administration of planning in South Australia 1972-1993</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP E - Lord Mayors and Chairmen of the CADC/CAPC, and City Planners of Adelaide 1972-1993</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a. RW (Bob) Clampett</td>
<td>Lord Mayor; Chairman CADC 1973-1975 (Reference Interview 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a. JJ (John) Roche</td>
<td>Lord Mayor; Chair CADC; Chairman CAPC 1975-77 (Reference Interview 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a. JVS (Jim) Bowen</td>
<td>Lord Mayor; Chair CADC 1975-1981 (Reference Interview 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. IU (Wendy) Chapman</td>
<td>Lord Mayor; Chair CADC 1981-1983.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. SG (Steve) Condous</td>
<td>Lord Mayor; Chair CADC 1987-1993.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a GC (Gilbert) Currie</td>
<td>City Planner 1982-1984 (Reference Interview 8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP F - Chief Executives of the State planning agency, Senior Planners, and Secretaries of the CAPC 1972-93</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a. JH (John) Mant</td>
<td>Director Urban Development; 1976-1979 (Reference Interview 15).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. R (Bob) Teague</td>
<td>Director (Legal) Environment &amp; Planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a G (Gavin) Lloyd-Jones</td>
<td>Secretary CAPC 1981-1984 (Reference Interview 18).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP G - Deputy Lord Mayors responsible for City Plan reviews, selected CADC Commissioners, Members of the State Review</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a W (Bill) Manos</td>
<td>Deputy Lord Mayor; Chair 1986-91 City of Adelaide Plan Committee (Reference Interview 14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. M (Mark) Hamilton</td>
<td>Deputy Lord Mayor; Chair 1991-96 City of Adelaide Plan Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. J (Judith) Brine</td>
<td>State Member CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. D (Derek) Scrafton</td>
<td>State Member CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. R (Rod) Fayze</td>
<td>State Member CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. J (Jane) Jose</td>
<td>Council Member CAPC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. BL (Brian) Hayes</td>
<td>Chair State Planning Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. S (Steve) Hammet</td>
<td>Member State Planning Review, Academic, Author, South Adelaide resident.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four of the Lord Mayors during the period 1972 to 1993 were already deceased (Hayes, Joseph, Watson and Jarvis) when the research commenced; one (Jarvis) had died only recently. It was therefore considered important to prioritise the interviews of the eleven “Elder Statesmen”, now in their 80s, as soon as possible and out of what would have been the normal sequence for this research project. This need was also recognized by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee when granting its approval for the interviews to be carried out.\(^{12}\) It is noted former Lord Mayor Roche (Oral History Interview 4) died in April 2010 and former Lord Clampett (Oral History Interview 9) died in August 2010. All the 47 interviewees were personally known to the researcher and thus he was comfortable with the task of approaching them for an interview. Important personal perspectives of key individuals were therefore obtained early in the research.

1.2.5 COLLECTING THE DATA

How the oral history data was collected is described in this Section. Seldon & Pappworth (1983) and Perks (1995) describe approaches to oral histories and methods of referencing them and the researcher has used the style of name; oral history interview (ohi) number; identifier within the "Signed Record of Interview"; location; and date of interview. All historical sources, whether they are documentary or oral, are subject to some influences of selectivity, interpretation and partiality (Perks 1995, p.7). The procedure followed for the interview of the 11 "Elder Statesmen" in Group A was:

- The researcher made personal contact by telephone and advised the nature of the research and whether the individual would be prepared to be interviewed;
- A letter was posted to the interviewees containing the information required by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee which was an Information Sheet, a Consent Form, a Contact sheet, and the Research Questions which would form the basis for the interview;
- Further telephone contact was made to arrange a mutually convenient time for the interview;
- The researcher travelled to the interviewee's home for ten of the interviews and in one case to the Hyatt Hotel in North Terrace where the interviewee was staying;
- In all cases the interviewee kindly offered some refreshment which provided a relaxed and informal setting before the interview commenced;
- The interview was recorded using a Digital Voice Tracer, and a back up tape recording was also used;\(^{13}\)
- The recording was uploaded onto the researcher’s computer at his postgraduate office (with a copy to his own laptop) and appropriately designated as a file;
- The recording was played back through the computer and, with the use of the pause button, the researcher personally typed up the Interview Notes as recommended by Poland (1999) and Patton (2002).

\(^{12}\) See Appendix 3 for the approval of the Committee.
\(^{13}\) See Appendix 4 for technical details of all the equipment used.
A further letter was posted to the interviewee containing the draft Interview Notes. It was made clear that the interviewee had the right to add to or amend the Notes, and to indicate if any of the information provided was to be treated in confidence;

Arrangements were made for a second meeting to go through the interviewee's comments and suggestions;

The researcher again travelled to the interviewee's home (and in one case the Lounge of the Hyatt Hotel) and comments and suggestions were discussed in detail. In all cases the interviewee had "marked up" a copy of the draft Notes and the researcher made sure that he understood all aspects of the response;

The required changes were made and a final version of the of the Interview Notes was return posted to the interviewee for a signature of approval; and,

After a further period of about a week another telephone contact was made to arrange a time when the researcher could go and collect the signed final version of the Interview Notes.

The initial Research Questions which were used for these interviews in Group A were:

- What were the factors, both people and events, from 1972, which resulted in the City of Adelaide having its own unique and separate Planning and Development system?
- How and why was the City able to maintain its separate system until the early 1990s?
- What were the reasons which lead the State Government to reintegrate the City's system into the overall State system through the new Development Act, 1993?

The interviews were in-depth and open-ended after initial discussion on the Research Questions which had been provided to the interviewees in advance (Patton 2002, p.20). It was recognized that different sets of research questions were needed for each discrete group of interviewees and the timeframe to which they related. But, it was also recognized that the core questions had to be as similar as possible to enable cross-comparison of responses and perspectives.

As a result of the Group A interviews and as the research work progressed, the Research Questions were amended for Groups B and C as follows:

- What were the factors that led to Interim Development Control being introduced in the City of Adelaide?
- How was the City able to have its own unique and separate Planning and Development system from 1976 until the early 1990s?
- Why did the State Government reintegrate the City's system into the overall State system through the new Development Act, 1993?

A field trip was organised to Sydney to carry out five interviews with individuals in Group B and the opportunity was also taken to visit the Archives of the Council of the City of Sydney. Archival material was researched in relation to the City of Sydney Strategic Plan (Council of the City of Sydney, 1971) and George Clarke who had died in 2005.14

---

14 George Clarke was the Director of the Sydney Strategic Plan and subsequently the Director of the City of Adelaide Planning Study.
The interview procedure used for the Group A was followed for Groups B-G except that material was posted to and from the interviewees after the initial interview rather than the researcher making subsequent visits to the interviewees; the six individuals identified for interview in Group C were members of the City of Adelaide Planning Study Team and Advisors to the CADC. Two interviews were held in the interviewees' offices, as they were still working, and the other four were held in the interviewees' homes.

As a result of the interviews in Groups B and C the Research Questions were further amended for Group D, which comprised former Premiers of the State and former Ministers responsible for the administration of the planning legislation in South Australia from 1972 until 1993, and became:

- What were the factors that enabled the City of Adelaide to have its own unique and separate system of planning and development control for 21 years?
- Why was Interim Development Control introduced for the City in 1972 and why was the City's system re-integrated with the State's system in 1993?

Lord Mayors of Adelaide (who were also Chairmen of the CADC or its successor the CAPC) and City Planners of Adelaide were identified as Group E comprising eight individuals. It should be noted that the researcher was one of the four City Planners for the period from 1974 until 1993. Six interviews were conducted in the interviewees' homes and two in their offices.

A field trip was undertaken to Melbourne as two former Chief Executives of the South Australian Planning agency were then working in Victoria and were part of the Group F comprising State Chief Executives, Senior Planners and Secretaries of the CAPC. The opportunity was also taken to visit the Melbourne City Council and research Melbourne's approach to strategic planning in the 1970s (City of Melbourne, 1974). The interviews in this group were conducted in the interviewees' offices as they were still working, albeit in different roles from the ones they had played which had justified the interview. At this stage the Research Questions were reviewed and were slightly refined for Group G and became:

- What were the factors, both people and events, which enabled the City of Adelaide to have a unique and separate system of planning and development control for 21 years?
- Why was Interim Development Control introduced for the City in 1972?
- Why did the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 come into operation in 1977 and why was it repealed in 1993 when the City's system was re-integrated with the State's system?

The final group identified, Group G, consisted of the Deputy Lord Mayors who had been responsible for respective reviews of the City of Adelaide Plan in 1984-85 and in 1989-90, selected
Commissioners of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission from 1977 until 1993, and the three members of the State Planning Review appointed by the Government.

As indicated, a list of 65 potential interviewees had been identified. The vast majority of these were chosen logically because of the positions they had held and the roles they had played during the years 1972-1993. However, in Group G some discretion was exercised in relation to the Commissioners of the CAPC selected for interview. This was because a number of Commissioners identified had other roles including Lord Mayor or Chief Executive of the State planning agency, but others were simply Government or Council appointments. After consultation with the Secretaries of the CAPC and with the researcher’s own knowledge, four additional Commissioners were selected who were considered to have made a significant contribution to the work of the Commission. Of Group G, nine individuals were identified of which one declined to be interviewed. That individual was one of the three Members appointed by the Government to the State Planning Review and the individual considered that he could not add anything to the interviews given the involvement in this research by the other two members of the Review.

The Research Questions were refined as a result of further analysis and the interviews in Group G to two over-arching questions:

. In general, why was the City of Adelaide able to have an innovative and different approach to city planning and development control from 1972 until 1993?

. In particular, what were the important factors in the introduction of Interim Development Control for the City in October 1972; in the operation of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 from March 1977; and in the repeal of this legislation in December 1993 when Adelaide was integrated into a new State system partially based on the City's approach?

As a result of this identification and invitation process 47 interviews were undertaken with all the participants completing the "Consent Forms" and "Signed Record of Interview". Some information was provided to the researcher on the clear understanding that it was confidential. Such information was typed in italics in brackets (italics) in the "Signed Record of Interview" and an annotation made to reflect its status. As well as these documents the digital and tape recordings of the interviews are held in a secure location in the researcher's home. A copy of each of the 47 "Signed Record of Interview" (but with all the confidential information deleted) has been provided to the Adelaide City Archives and there is no limit on access to them.\footnote{See Appendix 5 for a copy of the Consent Form.} \footnote{Adelaide City Archives. Accession No.6295, Item 1.}
1.2.6 INTERPRETIVE RESEARCH THROUGH A REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF DOCUMENTS

The documents which were reviewed and analysed to provide the basis for interpretive research for the thesis are described in this Section. In addition to the researcher’s own personal records as the City Planner and Town Clerk/Chief Executive Officer, the researcher had unlimited access to the Adelaide City Archives for Council Minutes, Reports, Files and Lord Mayoral Annual Reports.

In Sydney, specific approval was given by the Sydney City Council to access the City of Sydney Archives for information about the Civic Reform Association, Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd and background papers on the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan* (Council of the City of Sydney, 1971). Permission was given by the Council to publish the material researched.

George Clarke’s widow, Krystyna Luczak, kindly provided a compact disc containing scanned copies of all Clarke’s personal papers in relation to his work on the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan* (Council of the City of Sydney, 1971) and the *City of Adelaide Planning Study* (Urban Systems Corporation, 1974). She granted permission for any of this material to be published.

The Chief Executive of Planning SA gave special permission to access the Reports and Minutes of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission from 1977 to 1993 through the State Records Office. State Government legislation, *Hansard* and the *Gazette* were accessed in the State Library or on-line through appropriate www links from the Government’s website SA Central (http://www.sa.gov.au).

Coverage of relevant city planning issues in *The Advertiser* and *The Australian* from 1972 until 1993 and the *Adelaide Review* from 1984 until 1993 was accessed on-line. However, back editions of *The News* from 1972 until 1987 have not been digitised and were only available for inspection in hard copy form in the Somerville Room of the State Library of South Australia. These editions of *The News* for the period October 1972 until September 1974 were very relevant as considerable coverage was given to the Planning Study in this newspaper compared to very little in *The Advertiser*. The *City News* commenced publication in 1985 and the *City Messenger* in 1986 and editions of these city-local newspapers until 1993 were also available.
1.2.7 TRIANGULATION

Triangulation involves checking findings against a variety of different sources and is a technique for reducing bias.

Patton (1990, p.470) defined triangulation as:

A process by which the researcher can guard against the accusation that a study's findings are simply an artefact or a single method, a single source or a single investigator's biases.


Because each method of conducting research brings with it particular strengths and weaknesses, many researchers believe that combined methods provide appropriate checks against the weak points in each while simultaneously enabling the benefits to complement each other.

Triangulation for this thesis has been achieved through:

- primary research through oral histories arising from the 47 personal interviews;
- analysis of primary research sources of Council Minutes and Reports; State Government Papers; Hansards and Gazettes; and,
- analysis of secondary research sources of articles in state and local newspapers.

1.2.8 ANALYSING THE DATA AND THE EMERGENCE OF THEMES

This Section describes the data that was analysed and the themes that emerged. The 47 oral history interviews generated a vast quantity of information. Considerable material was available from the primary and secondary texts covering the period 1836 until 1972. Data from Council and State Government sources, journals, local newspapers and the researcher's personal records was extensive for the period from 1972 until 1993. Wolcott (1994) addresses the analysis of qualitative data. Groat & Wang (1998) observe that the major task of the analysis of data is to make it manageable so that themes could emerge while Strauss & Corbin (1998) consider that analysis is a two-way street between data and the researcher.

As a result of a detailed analysis of the information contained in the 47 interviews and of the primary and secondary texts, four themes emerged for the investigation within this thesis. It is noted these themes were not co-developed with the interviewees. They were not stated or consciously used by the researcher in the interviews, nor were referred back to the interviewees for comment. Colours were used to highlight potential themes from all the records of interview and then these were
progressively collapsed into four themes by a process of initial groupings, refinement and deletions (Patton, 2002; Flick, 2006).

The four THEMES are that the heritage of the City arising from Colonel Light's original plan in 1836 made Adelaide different from the other capital cities in Australia. Through the influence of key individuals there was a particular relationship between the City and State in terms of their respective power and the governance of the City. In the 1960s the policies of the Council and the statutory provisions of the State's Metropolitan Development Plan (Government of South Australia, 1962) contributed to a considerable loss of residential population from the City. These issues provided reasons for major reform in 1972 necessitating an innovative and different legislative approach to the integration of strategic and statutory planning of an Australian capital city that was introduced through separate legislation for Adelaide.

1.2.9 SUMMARY

This Chapter has described the qualitative mixed method research methodology applied in this research in terms of the approach taken and how the data was collected and analysed. Four Themes and two refined Research Questions emerged from this analysis. The four Themes are:

- The heritage of the City of Adelaide arising from Colonel Light's original plan,
- The influence of key individuals in terms of the City/State relationship,
- The governance of the City with reference to the respective powers of the City and State, and
- The integration of strategic and statutory planning in Adelaide.

The two Research Questions are:

- In general, why was the City of Adelaide able to have an innovative and different approach to city planning and development control from 1972 until 1993?
- In particular, what were the important factors in the introduction of Interim Development Control for the City in October 1972; in the operation of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 from March 1977; and in the repeal of this legislation in December 1993 when Adelaide was integrated into a new State system partially based on the City's approach?
CHAPTER 1.3

Literature Review – Theory and Adelaide

1.3.1 INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter the relevant planning and historical literature is reviewed to assess the current state of knowledge regarding innovation and difference in the city planning of Adelaide in terms of planning theory; the background for the founding of Adelaide and South Australia in 1836; the development of the City and State and their relationship from 1840 until 1950; changing attitudes to city planning in the City and State from 1950 until 1972; intergovernmental relations as the context for the exercise of the city planning function both internationally and in Australian capital cities (except Adelaide) during the 1970s; and the politics of city planning in Adelaide for four distinct periods during the years from 1972 until 1993. The relevant literature is then specifically referenced throughout the thesis. Gaps in the knowledge will be identified and the theoretical basis for the thesis will be provided.

1.3.2 PLANNING THEORY

Planning theory literature is examined in this Section. Planning theory internationally has been explored extensively by Chadwick (1971), Faludi (1973, 1978, 1979), Rabinovitz (cited in Faludi 1973), Friedman & Barclay (1974), Krueckeberg & Silvers (1974), Quade (1975), Hudson (1979), Krueckeberg (1979), Friedman (1981), Healy, McDougall & Thomas (1982), Self (1982), Moore (1990), Badcock (2002), Ward (2004), Allmendinger (2009), Sager (2010) and Versteeg & Hajer (2010). The importance of involving the public in the planning process was also raised in The Report of the Skeffington Committee in the UK (1969), and Eversley (1973) addressed the changing role of the planner in society and the need to engage the public. The researcher has specifically used the works of Allmendinger, Badcock, Rabinovitz and Self, to frame the theoretical context of this thesis.

Rabinovitz (cited in Faludi 1973, p.198) identified four planning styles – Cohesive; Executive-centred; Competitive, and Fragmented. The cohesive style was characterised by a small number of people in the community who were from old established families who tended to decide policy and had a basic agreement about what the town should look like and how it should grow. The role of the planner was that of a technician and bureaucrat. The Executive-centred style recognised the influence of a leader
but also that compromises had to be made with other community leaders. Differences could be settled within the system itself. The planner was identified with the leader and lost objectivity. The competitive style was characterised by several leadership cliques and open conflict was the rule. Decision-making was a “zero – sum game” where a gain by one party was a loss by another. The planner acted as a broker to find acceptable solutions. The fragmented approach had no visible leadership group. This closely approximated to the ideas of a pluralist society where the interests and powers of the various groups were seen to be balanced. In this scenario the planner was forced to be active and exercise choices and therefore became part of the political process.

Self (1982, p.6) argued that urban planning can be viewed as Efficiency; Environmental Improvement; Equality, and Community. He considers that efficiency is about the coordination of investment in infrastructure and the control of development to realise overall economies. Environmental improvement is seen as the traditional concern of separating incompatible land uses, specifying densities and protecting historic and cultural resources. Equality requires intervention to overcome environmental and social inequities and deal with urban blight, economic decline and social deprivation. Community is a difficult balancing act because there needs to be public involvement at the local level to determine local outcomes, but issues of metropolitan significance need to be determined by government.

Badcock (2002, pp.228-236) identified six political theories for planning decisions: Pluralism; Structural; Business Elites; Regulation; Urban Regimes; and Identity-based. Pluralism was developed by Banfield (1961) resulting from his work in Chicago with Meyerson in 1955 and was based on a planning decision being made taking into account the politics of each issue after weighing up the various interests involved. He argued that urban policy was made by the resolution of conflict amongst divergent interests rather than by intellectual and deliberative choice. Self (1982, p.35) considered the Chicago example a triumph of overt interests over latent interests and the avoidance of conflict by the city council. However, Versteeg & Hajer (2010, p.161) assert that planning practices have changed since the early studies about power in the planning process by Meyerson & Banfield (1955) and Banfield (1961). While interest groups clustered around elected political leaders there was a clear centre of power. But citizen input into the process came to be regarded as an almost universal good and politicians became unable to make a decision without it.

In Structural theory it was argued that the ruling class in capitalist societies ensured decisions taken resulted in the further accumulation of capital. Historically founded Business Elites combined limited
urban experience with narrow self-interest but exercised undue influence in state decision-making about cities. A phase of decline in capitalism resulted in Regulations being eased and a market approach being taken to encourage development. In Urban Regimes the focus changed from who had the power to govern to the process of governing where outcomes were agreed through a sharing of power. Identity-based politics had regard for the work of Young (1990) and Castells (1997) and was seen as an alternative to political parties and institutions. Local communities were constructed through collective action and identities emerged as a defence against disorder and the rate of change. Cohesive; Executive-centred; Competitive, and Fragmented styles (Rabinovitz) are comparable to Business Elites; Urban Regimes; Structural, and Pluralism (Badcock). Community theory (Self) and Identity-based theory (Badcock) are also similar.

Pluralism is seen by Allmendinger (2009, p.160) as many competing interest groups with widely diffused power and overlapping memberships. He argues there is a distinction between Pluralism as analysis and Pluralism as the normative position (ibid, p.163).

The overlaps and similarities in the terminology between Rabinovitz, Self, Badcock and Allmendinger are understandable as they are theorists who see planners as part of the state apparatus with very different interests from those of the community. Having regard to the political context of Adelaide it is argued that Pluralism is relevant because the politicians of the State and the City made decisions on an issue basis taking into account the prevailing political circumstances of the time. Both Structural and Business Elites were relevant from the founding of the City and during its development until 1972 but then declined in influence. At this point and until 1993 Urban Regimes became particularly relevant because there was an agreed outcome for the City through a sharing of power between the State and the City. While Identity-based politics came to the fore in Western democracies in the late 1960s and early 1970s, it is clear that this concept can be applied to this study because of the influence of individuals involved, starting with Light and Hindmarsh, through Playford and Hart in the State, and Veale and Bubb in the City, until the influence of Stretton emerged through the reformist Premier Dunstan and the reformist Lord Mayor Hayes in 1971. This leaves Regulation. Given the foregoing, it is concluded that the easing of Regulations did not apply in any way to the period 1972 until 1993 as the nature of city planning in Adelaide during this time included the strict application of the statutory development controls.
Thus **Pluralism** and **Identity-based politics** have been chosen as the framework to address planning in the City of Adelaide from 1836, but specifically for the period 1972 until 1993, to ground the researcher’s analysis of the multitude of political relationships between City and State and the various ways in which they were expressed.

1.3.3 BACKGROUND FOR THE FOUNDING OF ADELAIDE AND SOUTH AUSTRALIA

In this Section literature relevant to the background of founding Adelaide and South Australia is examined. The early European settlement of Australia is well documented in Eddy (1969), Evans & Nicholls (1976) and Hughes (1987). The philosophical ideas for the Colony of South Australia were first articulated by Wakefield (1831, 1832). The early settlement of South Australia has been addressed extensively by Grenfell Price (1924) while Pike (1967) and Whitelock (1977) have provided insightful perspectives as to why free-settled South Australia was different from the other Australian Colonies which all had penal settlements. Berg (2010) has questioned whether the protocols required by the legislation were followed by Hindmarsh in the proclamation of the ‘Province’ and asserts that South Australian Aboriginals may have legal avenues for redress. Cochrane (2006) has discussed the foundations of democracy in the Australian colonies overall.

Writings about Colonel Light are examined in Napier (1836), Loyau (1883), Steuart (1901), Gill (1910), Mayo (1937), Dutton (1960), Whitelock (1977), Elder (1984,1987) and Page & Ingpen (1985). As well, there is Light’s own Brief Journal (1839). Cheesman (1986), Hutchings & Bunker (1986), Johnson & Langmead (1986), Hutchings (2007) and Freestone (2010) have considered in detail the background to and origins of Light’s Plan for Adelaide and the importance of the Park Lands, and questions as to the influences on it. Jones (2006, 2007) reviewed the historical development of the Park Lands and the City Squares. However, none of the authors as above has raised the disagreement between Light and Hindmarsh about the siting of the City as the beginning of the relationship and balance of power between the City and the State which is argued in this thesis.

1.3.4 DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY AND STATE AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP FROM 1840 UNTIL 1950

Literature relevant to the context within which the City and the State developed from 1840 until 1950 is reviewed in this Section. Discourses on the historical growth of town planning internationally have

Progressive histories of the Council of the City of Adelaide and the City have been written by Worsnop (1878) for the period 1840-1878; Morton (1996) for the period 1878-1928, and by Linn (2006) for the period 1929-1979. Morgan (1971) provided a history of The Adelaide Club while Fischer & Seamark (2005) asserted the Club had significant influence on the development of the State. However, these authors have not addressed the issue of governance or the importance of individuals in the development of the City of Adelaide which is examined and analysed in this thesis.

1.3.5 CHANGING ATTITUDES TO PLANNING IN THE CITY AND THE STATE FROM 1950 UNTIL 1972

In the late 1960s and early 1970s there was a growing movement of people in Western democracies who were concerned about the impacts of Master Plans (“end-state” plans) prepared by government agencies into which they had had no input. Relevant literature is identified in this Section. These “end-state” plans prompted extensive works on transportation, land use and high-rise residential development which are relevant to this period in Adelaide. These include Buchanan (1963), Alonso (1964), Jensen (1966), Freeland (1968), Antoniou (1971), Alexander (1972), Bell & Tyrwhitt (1972), Alexander (1974), Stillwell (1974), Hutchings & Bunker (1986), Stretton (1986), Hall (1998), Diefendorf (2000), Freestone (2000, 2007, 2008, 2010), Bunker (2002), Davison (2004), Haigh (2007) and Hutchings (2007). The Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study (Government of South Australia, 1962) is a classic example of the “end-state” Master Plan and the reaction to it was a
contributing factor in the introduction of an innovative and different approach to governance in the City which is examined in this thesis.

Community protests against freeways and comprehensive redevelopment schemes occurred in Sydney (The Rocks and Woolloomooloo), in Adelaide (Hackney) and in Melbourne (Carlton). This led to the rise of residents’ action groups which in turn brought about change in elected Local Councils and a more community-based approach to planning. The nature of expert advice and the governance of cities were being questioned as the public demanded more say in decisions about development. Starting with the seminal works of Young & Wilmot (1957) in Britain and Jacobs (1961) in the USA there was a considerable body of work about the failures of planning without public participation authored during this period. Davidoff (1965), Althshuler (1966), Chermayeff & Alexander (1966), Arnstein (1969), Friend & Jessop (1969), Colman (1971), Gans (1972), Goodman (1972), Pugh (1973), Rowland (1973), Simmie (1974), Pahl (1975), Sandercock (1975b), Forester (1981), Clavel (1986), Lemon (1993) and Douglass & Friedmann (1998), all addressed the lack of public participation in the planning process and its implications during the 1960s and 1970s. George Clarke (1972) was influential in ensuring public involvement in the preparation of the City of Sydney Strategic Plan 1971 (SCC, 1971) and in his City of Adelaide Planning Study (Urban Systems Corporation, 1974) as analysed in this inquiry.

Foucault (1980) looked at the relationship between power and knowledge and how political action was subsequently shaped. Flyvberg (1998) then applied Foucault’s work to the way in which the development of cities can be shaped and how power can be exercised at the local level. His analysis of planning in the Danish city of Aalborg demonstrates the separation between the ‘planner’ and the ‘planned’. Linn (2006) reviewed some aspects of this situation in the City of Adelaide in the 1970s. While these authors wrote from different theoretical perspectives, their concerns were with planning systems that were expert-led and had little regard for public participation in the process. The analysis in this thesis is structured along distinctive periods within the timeline from 1836 until 1993, drawing on themes which seek to illuminate how key individuals shaped the development of the City of Adelaide.
The limited literature about planning in Adelaide from 1972 until 1993 is covered in this Section. The earlier *Metropolitan Development Plan* (1962) and the *Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study* (1963) are relevant State publications. The *First Statement of Policy* (CADC, 1972) and *Second Statement of Policy* (CADC, 1975) were important publications in relation to policy decisions by the City and State, as was George Clarke’s *City of Adelaide Planning Study* (Urban Systems Corporation, 1974). Roche & Llewellyn-Smith (1975) provided a critique of the study and the direction the City was taking. Young-Anglim (1975) and Badcock & Clother (1978) reviewed aspects of city living in Adelaide and argued for affordable housing to be provided.


Brine (1985) provided abstracts of all the theses accepted for Masters’ Degrees from 1965 until 1985 when there was a professionally recognised planning course at the University of Adelaide. This inventory was reviewed and some of these theses, although unpublished, provided useful background for this research, especially those from the mid 1970s when planning in the City of Adelaide was of considerable interest.
Buttrose (1971) considered some of the statutory provisions of the *Metropolitan Development Plan* while Bennett (1971), Daunt (1976) and Gayler (1979) reviewed aspects of the South Australian planning legislation. Madigan (1972), Tan (1976), Horner (1978) and Zacest (1978) looked at different elements of planning in the City of Adelaide. Shelton (1986) viewed Adelaide in terms of traditional and modernist concepts of city space. However, none of these researchers addressed the politics of planning in the City during the period under review, and this is a gap which this thesis is filling.

### 1.3.7 SUMMARY

In this Chapter the literature covering the relevant topics as outlined has been briefly reviewed but it will be specifically referenced in the respective Chapters of the thesis. Having regard to all these works it is considered that there is no comprehensive review and analysis of the innovative and different approach to planning and development control in the City of Adelaide covering the whole of the period from 1972 until 1993 within the historical framework of the politics of the relationship between the City and State from 1836.
Chapter 1.4

Literature Review – Theory and Context

Intergovernmental relations - The exercise of the city planning function between upper and lower levels of government - Britain - Canada - New Zealand - United States of America - Australia - capital cities - Brisbane - Canberra - Darwin - Hobart - Melbourne - Perth - Sydney

1.4.1 INTRODUCTION

In this thesis it is argued that the system of planning and development control within the City of Adelaide for the period 1972 until 1993 was innovative and different. This resulted from a joint approach by the State Government of South Australia and the Adelaide City Council to the governance of the City. The review of literature in this Chapter provides a framework for comparing the situation in South Australia and Adelaide by examining intergovernmental relations in Britain, Canada, New Zealand, the United States of America and the other capital cities in Australia. Canada and New Zealand are included because they are two countries of the British Commonwealth with a common language and heritage which inherited the tradition of Anglo-North American town planning. The principle of subsidiarity, that a higher level authority should only perform those tasks which cannot be performed by a lower level authority, is an important one in terms of governance. The relationship and exercise of power between a city (local government) and its respective upper level of government (state/provincial or national) is analysed. The influence of individuals and approaches to statutory and strategic planning in the capital cities of Australia (except Adelaide) in the early 1970s by the respective Councils and State Governments are then examined.

1.4.2 POWER AND GOVERNANCE

Jensch (1980) asserts that politics is not about morality or doing the right thing for the community, it is about one thing – power. Versteeg & Hajer (2010, p.171) assert there are three levels of power relations. At the micro level there are specific episodes and interpersonal relationships and actions. At the meso level there are institutional practices and the selection of stakeholders determines the way in which issues are framed. At the macro level the governance culture and embedded cultural values control the discourse and practices. Giddens (2002, p.68) defines democracy as a system where there is competition between political parties to achieve positions of power. The nature of the different legislative systems in Britain, Canada, New Zealand, the United States of America and
Australia for the governance of cities in these countries has implications for the way in which the respective city planning processes operate. Intergovernmental relations are carried out through the actions of public governing bodies and governmental officials. Thus it is people who are the real actors in intergovernmental relations (Anderson 1960, p.4). While there can never be a clear line of demarcation between the policy role of politicians and the administrative role of officials, the history of the public service in Western democracies has been to limit individual or political party patronage and avoid corrupt practices (Robson 1957, p.587). Claridge & Box (2001, p.4) assert the issue is who makes the decision, and is it made at the level at which it is appropriate for the decision to be made?

Subsidiarity can be seen as ensuring decisions are made by those most directly affected, by those best informed, and by those best placed to deal with the consequences. Guerin (2002, p.13) argues that subsidiarity as a concept provides a broad framework within which to examine the allocation of governmental responsibilities. It provides the best compromise between the availability of information, the costs and benefits of the decision, and the accountability of decision-makers. Power ought to be passed down to the smallest political unit within a society that is capable of undertaking a required public function (Chandler 1996, p.3; Guerin 2002, p.1). Gleeson & Low (2000, p.213) argue that in terms of governance an upper level of government should not undertake what a lower level can do for itself.

The issues of power and governance, as addressed in this Section, are examined as part of intergovernmental relations in Britain, Canada, New Zealand, the United States of America and Australia in the following Sections of this Chapter. The implications for the governance of cities and the exercise of the city planning function in these countries are analysed.

1.4.3 THE EXERCISE OF THE CITY PLANNING FUNCTION BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

Literature identified in this Section about intergovernmental relations in countries with an Anglo-North American tradition of town planning (Britain, Canada, New Zealand and the USA) and in the Australian capital cities (except Adelaide) provides the context to examine the exercise of the city planning function between a city and its respective upper level of government. A comparison can then be drawn to the relationship between the upper and lower levels of government in South Australia, namely the State and the City.
Graves (1950) addressed the system of public administration in the United States of America. Anderson (1960) gave examples of the governance of cities around the world including Sydney. Wingfield (1963) considered city planning decision-making. Graves (1964) looked specifically at intergovernmental relations in the USA while the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (1965) and Reps (1965) considered city planning in the USA in the broader governmental context. Banovetz (1971) and Robson & Regan (1972) looked at city planning from a management perspective. The British system of government was reviewed by Birch (1973) while Chandler (1996) reviewed local government generally within the overall system. Painter (1991, 1995) analysed intergovernmental relations in Canada while Guerin (2002) discussed them in New Zealand. In Australia, Stretton (1978) expanded his views about the importance of urban planning. A comprehensive review of the Australian system was provided by Galligan, Hughes & Walsh (1991) while Cameron (2001) covered the structures of Australian intergovernmental relations. What is of interest in all these writings is governance - the power that the higher level of government was able to exercise over the lower level through political and economic means. However, as will be discussed in this thesis, what was different in Adelaide was the power the Council of the City of Adelaide was able to exercise in relation to the State Government of South Australia through the Legislative Council of Parliament. This power was quite considerable and existed from the early days of the Colony until the political situation changed in the early 1990s. This extends Badcock’s theory because the Local Government level in Adelaide was not subservient to the State during this period.

Planning in greater Sydney was addressed by Winston (1957). The first strategic plan for an Australian capital city was in Sydney (Sydney City Council, 1971) and the relevant statutory plan was the County of Cumberland Planning Scheme (NSW Government Printer, 1971). Briger (1988), Ward (1988) and Webber (1988) provided different perspectives about planning the city centre while Spearritt & DeMarco (1988) addressed the broader issue of planning Sydney’s future. Ashton (1993) looked at the history of the city and Golder (2004) reviewed the history of the Sydney City Council. None of these works considered the issue of the governance of the City of Sydney within the State.

In Melbourne the strategy plan for the city was published by the Council (Melbourne City Council, 1974) and the relevant statutory plan was part of the metropolitan region (Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, 1971). Logan (1981) commented on the difficulties of the planning system in Victoria in terms of translating Melbourne’s strategic plan into a statutory planning scheme. Dunstan (1984) addressed governing the Melbourne metropolitan area. Logan (1985) assessed the implications of the gentrification of the city. Davison (1978) and Davison & May (1992) reviewed the history of Melbourne while McLoughlin (1992) provided an overview of planning in Melbourne and its region. These works illustrate the difficulties of planning in the City of Melbourne within the broader governance arrangements of the State.

The history of planning in the City of Brisbane was reviewed by Toms (1976) and Cole (1984). The City of Perth lodged a draft statutory City Planning Scheme in 1973 but there were years of disagreement between the Council and the Western Australian Metropolitan Regional Planning Authority about the nature and future direction of the City which prevented adoption of the scheme. Gregory (2003) covered the history of the Council of the City of Perth from the 1950s. In Hobart a statutory scheme for City without strategic objectives was adopted in 1977 (Hobart City Council, 1977). In Darwin the Northern Territory Government has never allowed the City of Darwin to have a role in strategic planning and only a very limited role in statutory planning which has been the responsibility of the Government’s Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

Overall (1995) provided a personal view of the planning of Canberra. Freestone (1997) argued that Griffin’s plan for Canberra was unique mix of the city beautiful and garden city movements. But as Canberra developed there was more concern with garden suburbs and transportation. Later planning in Canberra was described by the National Capital Development Commission (1965, 1970) and reviewed by Taylor (2006).
These texts provide the data about planning in the capital cities of Australia, except Adelaide, and the relationship between the respective State and local governments but Canberra is excluded because of its special circumstances as the national capital. They all add weight to the argument that the situation in Adelaide was different in that a joint approach between the State government and Local government was taken to the planning of the City for a defined period of twenty-one years, from 1972 until 1993.

Stretton’s *Ideas for Australian Cities* (1970) is the most important text pertinent to this thesis because of the philosophical impact it had on the then Premier of South Australia, Don Dunstan and the then Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Bill Hayes. Stretton was subsequently an important influence in the innovative and different approach to planning applied in Adelaide as a member of the City of Adelaide Development Committee and as Deputy Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust.

1.4.4 PLANNING IN BRITAIN

Britain is a constitutional monarchy with a Parliament consisting of the House of Commons and the House of Lords. Parliament is convened and prorogued by the monarch acting on the advice of Prime Minister and the majority party in the House of Commons is invited to form the government (Ward 2004, p.35). There is a two level system of governance, national and local. It is argued the cities (local government) and their planning functions are subordinate to the power and influence of the upper (national) level of government.

Birch (1973, p.241) asserts the initiative for local government in Britain came from reformers who were concerned with the efficient provision of services in the areas of public health, sanitation and clean water for the masses in the cities who were cut off from the countryside. The *Municipal Corporations Act, 1835* provided for the governance of cities by elected councils and by the 1850s most of the larger British cities were ruled in this way (Chandler 1996, p.19). The *Local Government Act, 1894* created elected County Councils and a later amendment in 1894 created urban and district councils. County Councils assumed the responsibility for all statutory planning schemes in 1929 (Birch 1973, p.272).

Cullingworth asserts the *Barlow Report* published in 1940 was important because it recommended urban and regional planning should apply to Britain as a whole rather than to individual local
authorities. The *Uttwatt Report* on Compensation and Betterment, the *Scott Report* on Land Utilisation in Rural Areas, and the *Beveridge Report* on Social Insurance and Allied Services all contributed to providing a framework for addressing long standing social and economic problems. The outcome of these reports was the *Town and Country Planning Act, 1947* which brought all development under control by making it subject to planning permission. County Councils were responsible for preparing Development Plans and a new Ministry of Town and Country Planning was established as the central agency to provide oversight of these local plans. The *Act* provided for strict zoning controls, especially the separation of housing from industry (Cullingworth 1964, p.43).

Large cities were administered by a single authority known as a County Borough, while the rest of the country had a two-tier system. The County Council was the upper level and the lower level was known as Boroughs, Urban Districts or Rural Districts (Birch 1973, p.242; Chandler 1996, p.21). Ward (2004, p.100) asserts that the County Development Plans were essentially precise physical blueprint plans that specified an “end-state” for land use at the conclusion of the plan period, normally twenty years. For the first time there was a system of comprehensive physical planning. However, in terms of governance Keeble (1969, p.37) observes all Development Plans required the approval of the national Minister of Housing and Local Government before they had statutory effect.

Robson (1954, p.35) argues that far larger units of local government were needed to provide for effective town and country planning but the system of County Development Plans requiring national government approval continued until 1972. Brand (1974, p.66) observes the *Redcliffe-Maud Report* proposed substantial restructuring of local government in England, Wales and Scotland. While the Labor Government accepted these recommendations, the proposals were shelved when the Conservatives came to power in 1970 and a new and powerful Department of the Environment was created (Chandler 1996, p.278).

Birch argues that local authorities are not valued by the national government and they are seen as useful but not essential agencies for implementing and coordinating policies whose principles are devised at the centre. Birch also observes all the restructuring in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s tended towards larger unitary authorities with reforms being less community based and more subject to national control. Even though the most important public services are administered by local authorities, the final responsibility for them rests with a national ministry (Birch 1996, p. 269).
Thus the national control of local government determines how local authorities are organised, what services they must provide (such as development control), what other services they may choose to provide, and how the services are administered. National control is exercised because local government receives over half its income from grants from the national government. Local government accepts control by the national government as a condition of life and the conduct of local affairs is shaped by regulations and circulars. Local government may have some control over decision-making at the local level. But this is only within the limits set by the national government through the Department of the Environment which exercises a great deal of influence, especially in the city planning function (Birch 1996, pp.243-248).

Birch asserts centralist elites have considered lower levels of government to be of a lesser quality and standard and therefore it is perfectly legitimate to subordinate them to national power and control. There is a deeply ingrained thinking in Britain that the national government has the right to impose its values on the structure and processes of local government17 (Birch 1996, pp.272-276).

It has been argued in this Section that the national government exerts considerable influence and control over local planning and this determines the nature of city planning in Britain. The planning situation in Canada will be examined in the next Section.

1.4.5 PLANNING IN CANADA

Canada is a constitutional monarchy and through the Constitution Act, 1867 is a federation of ten Provinces and the Nunavut Territory. The powers of the national government and the provincial governments are determined by the Act. From a governance perspective the Provinces are jealous of their exclusive responsibility for local government (Hayes 1976, pp.28-29). Cullingworth (1987) and Artibise & Stelter (1981, 2007), amongst others, have written extensively about urban and regional planning in Canada.

Cullingworth asserts the national and provincial governments have an autonomous and independent political relationship but the relationship between provincial and local government is very different as

---

17The researcher worked as an architect and planner in local government in Britain in the late 1960s and experienced this attitude first hand.
the Provinces are responsible for the existence of local government and determine its powers, including its planning powers (Cullingworth 1987, pp.45-46).

Hayes observes the national government has control over railways, harbours and airports; he argues it is important to integrate these into provincial and local urban planning. The provincial planning Acts require local governments to prepare plans for their areas. These plans usually include broad statements about social and economic aspirations and describe what development can take place on land through zoning and building controls (Hayes 1976, p.39).

Hayes (1976 p.47) asserts there are problems of national and provincial coordination in Canada. There is an Office of National/Provincial Relations which is meant to handle the national government’s approach to the Provinces but conflicts are a fundamental characteristic of Canada’s federal system which could be described as a loosely–knit voluntary association of mutually hostile Provinces (Galligan, Hughes & Walsh, p.104).

Cullingworth (1987, p.47) argues the provincial governments have three dimensions in the governance of urban planning. The first is the relationship to the national government, the second is to local government and the third is where they operate independently. The Provinces expect their planning policies to be operated by local government and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities has complained that local government has been reduced to a position of being “puppets on a string” (ibid p.64).

Feldman & Graham (1979, p.101) observe local councillors are often elected on the basis of a parochial planning issue rather than on an articulated policy platform for the area they wish to represent. Local government is noted for its service delivery but there is an inadequate property tax to meet the scale of expenditure required to meet the community’s rising standards and expectations for services, including the planning function (Cullingworth 1987, p.61).

Cullingworth (1987, p.70) also argues that there is a difference between a plan and an instrument for implementation of the plan, such as a zoning By-Law. A local government plan is only a general policy and the reality in Canada is that these plans exist within the framework of explicit planning policy statements determined by the Provinces.
While there is a three level system of governance in Canada, the national government only plays a limited role in the planning function at the local level and does so through the Provinces.

It is contended in this Section that the Provinces in Canada exert considerable influence over cities (the lower level of local government) by controlling the nature of their plans and requiring provincial government policies to be followed. The planning situation in New Zealand will be examined in the next Section.

1.4.6 PLANNING IN NEW ZEALAND

New Zealand is a constitutional monarchy but has an unwritten constitution. In 1876 the New Zealand parliament abolished Provincial Governments and in 1951 it abolished the Upper Chamber of the parliament. Consequently, New Zealand has a unitary parliament with members elected through a mixed member proportional system (New Zealand Government, 2009). Local government is created by statute. As there is no written constitution, in terms of governance there is not always a clear separation of national government and local government roles. The processes of national government policy formation determine the allocation of accountabilities (Guerin 2002, p.3).

Guerin argues the fundamental constraint for local government is the scope within which it can operate and the degree to which the national government can intervene to modify outcomes. While the national government can delegate its powers to local government, the national government retains ultimate control and remains accountable for the appropriate exercise of powers that it has delegated. Local government therefore tends to operate as an agent of the national government, administering or interpreting rules set nationally (Guerin 2002, pp.11-12).

The Resource Management Act, 1991 replaced or amended more than 50 other laws relating to town planning and environmental management. It was designed to manage a wide range of issues including conflicting values, expectations and rights regarding planning and the environment. National Policy Statements and National Environmental Standards are tools which the national government can use to provide direction on specific national or local issues. The national government thus provides a policy framework within which local government can make decisions, including the exercise of the city planning function (New Zealand Government, 2009).
An important aspect of governance for the national government in New Zealand is the ability of the Minister of the Environment to “call in” a planning matter from local government if the Minister forms the view the issue is of national significance. The reasons for such a determination include widespread public concern or interest, the significant use of natural or physical resources, or the scale and significance of project itself. Once a matter has been “called in” by the Minister there are two options. The Minister can refer it to a Board of Inquiry consisting of three to five members and chaired by a current, former or retired Environment Judge. Alternatively, the matter is referred straight to the Environment Court for it to make a decision. In either case the national government has exerted its influence over local government which no longer has any role in determining the planning issues involved (New Zealand Government, 2009).

Councils are responsible for preparing a plan for their local government area and the plan must set out objectives, policies and rules to address resource management issues. Council plans are lodged with the Ministry for the Environment which is then responsible for advising the Minister on the appropriateness of the plan; thus power and control is maintained by the national government (Local Government New Zealand, 2009).

It is asserted in this Section that in New Zealand’s two level system of governance effective control over the planning function in cities is retained by the upper level (national) government over the lower level (local) government. Governance and the planning function in the United States of America are examined in the next Section.

1.4.7 PLANNING IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The 1776 constitution of the United States of America (USA) is based on the principle that the legislature (Congress and Senate) and head of government (President) should be elected and, to prevent these offices from becoming elected dictators, there should be a balance of power between the national government and the States, and between the executive, legislature and the judiciary (Birch 1996, p.254).

In this system of intergovernmental relations powers are divided between national, state and local governments. Intergovernmental relations is political because in its simplest form it is the ebb and flow of power from one level of government to another and is based on the political questions of who
controls what, for what purpose. These three levels of government have developed a pattern of governance which is not only desirable but necessary for the efficient accomplishment of their respective objectives (Graves 1950, p.68).

The national government recognised the importance of cooperation between governments in 1943 when it established a Federal Council on Intergovernmental Relations. The objective of this Council was to devise administrative procedures and a mechanism for blending more harmoniously the powers and interests of national, state and local governments in the execution of their common purposes (Graves 1950, p.74). Matthews (1976, p.22) asserts the central problem of federalism is how to reconcile the somewhat contradictory demands of coordination and autonomy; federalism is only strong when all three levels of government are strong. Young (1990, p.243) states cities have become increasingly dependent on national and state grants for their existence while Galligan, Hughes & Walsh (1991, p.5) observe federalism in the USA has a lot to do with the governance aspects of massive federal aid programs.

Anderson (1960, p.165) argues that the federal system is a competitive one and the States are still, to some extent, competitive with the national government and that local governments are competitive with the States. However, Galligan, Hughes & Walsh (1991, p.63) assert there has been an erosion of local autonomy. They use a variety of financial, employment and service measures to identify a trend to a greater concentration of resources at the state government level and an expanded policy-making role for the States in relation to local government. Young (1990, p.242) argues that cities are relatively powerless in relation to their respective States, and further that North American liberalism has always been hostile to a distinct and independent legal system for cities. Cities can only exercise those powers which are delegated to it by the State and these are usually limited by judicial interpretation. On the other hand, Birch asserts city government has some measure of independence with the power to levy taxes, raise loans and decide on the level of services, particularly in relation to the planning function. However, this is provided these are within the limits set by the respective State statutes (Birch 1973, p.243). Cullingworth (1973, p.455) argues that the national government is playing a much more significant role in the governance of local government by passing legislation covering such issues as environmental protection and hazardous waste disposal, and mandating the responsibility for these issues to local government.

Graves (1950, p.77) asserts autonomous Planning Commissions enjoyed popularity in the USA before WWII. They were given status by the Standard City Planning Act, 1928 prepared by a
committee appointed by Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce. The view was taken that planning should not be subjected to political interference. The Commission acted as a buffer between the planner and the political process. The Commission usually had five to nine members and was appointed by the Mayor or Council. It could therefore be argued that while the Commission was not legally responsible to the appointing body, it nevertheless retained political loyalty to that body (Graves1950, p.78).

Walker (1941) carried out a detailed analysis of the operation of 37 City Planning Commissions throughout North America and found they had had little impact on community development. He came to the conclusion that the city planning function should be integrated into the other operations of local government and not be the responsibility of an independent body. However, Walker recognised that Planning Commissions were essential instruments in making planning legitimate in that distinguished citizens sitting on a Commission were able to provide some confidence in the system. Banovetz (1971, p.317) argues this was important in terms of a Planning Commission’s right to control and regulate the private use of land.

Banovetz (1971, pp.239-242) asserts it is impossible to separate city planning from city management and that action programs arising from the city plan must be integrated with the overall activities of the city and reflected in the capital and operating budgets. By the early 1960s there was a general acceptance in the USA that planning was not restricted to land use planning. Planning was then no longer seen as a technical operation outside politics; it was a political process involving the formulation and execution of public policy to enumerate and realise human goals within an environmental framework (ibid, p.298).

Chapin (1965) details the importance of land use studies and their relevance to property values and zoning, including the use of codes and ordinances for the control of land use. Planning was traditionally data collection and analysis, public policy formation resulting in a plan, and then the administration of the instruments of the plan such as zoning. Cities are given authority for zoning by the State but State approval is not required provided the zoning is consistent with State statutes. A zoning ordinance is usually a map showing various zones in colour with text giving a general description and definitions for any necessary enforcement (Banovetz 1971, p.312). Anderson (1960, p.153) asserts the governance arrangement between cities and their respective States in the USA is limited to cities acting within the confines of their respective State constitutions.
Banovetz contends that by the 1970s there was an awareness of broader social and economic issues and that plans needed to be based on assumptions related to community goals with a set of principles and systematic steps so that these goals could be attained. Thus outcomes from the city planning function are not just the physical outcomes, but the dynamics of human life in the physical environment (Banovetz 1971, pp. 314-315).

It is contended a relevant aspect of planning in the USA is the ability of cities, through the Mayor or the Council, to appoint ‘independent’ Planning Commissions. However, compared to the governance arrangement of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission, appointed jointly by the City Council and State (as will be examined in Chapter 3.2), Planning Commissions in the USA have limited decision-making powers. As argued by Walker and Banovetz above, the function of a Planning Commission is not really governance, but to give legitimacy to land use aspects of the planning process and provide a buffer from the politics of City Hall.

The national government exerts influence with the States and local government through its financial power but this does not directly affect the governance of cities and the exercise of the city planning function. However, there has recently been a trend to mandate responsibilities in such fields as environmental protection to local government. The States do not approve city plans; they only have to ensure the statutory components are consistent with the State’s statutes.

It has been asserted in this Section that within the three levels of government in the USA cities, as the lower level of government, enjoy a degree of independence regarding the city planning function not found in the other countries examined in previous Sections of this Chapter. Governance and the exercise of the city planning function in Australia is examined and analysed in the next Section.

1.4.8 GOVERNANCE AND PLANNING IN AUSTRALIA

Australia is a constitutional monarchy with a Parliament consisting of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The 1901 constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia follows the USA model in allocating specific legislative powers to the national government and leaving the undefined residue to the state governments (Galligan, Hughes & Walsh 1991, p.3).
Galligan, Hughes & Walsh (1991, p.10) assert governance in Australia is complex which allows a variety of centralised and decentralised policy arrangements, but provides no precise criteria for sorting out which arrangements best suit a particular area of policy such as planning. Guerin (2002, p.10) argues that subsidiarity in Australia is strongly shaped by the strict constitutional framework. The leading characteristic of Australian federalism in the post war decades is fiscal and this creates the strongest drive towards centralism which is due to the dependence of the States on the national government's wider funding powers. The degree of authority over the States by the national government varies widely, often due to explicit or implicit constitutional constraints. Galligan, Hughes & Walsh (1991, p110) further argue that the principal responsibility of stabilisation and redistribution should rest with the national government, whereas the allocation of resources should be shared among all levels of government. The major criteria which should determine the role of each level of government in the allocation of resources is where the resulting public good is actually enjoyed.

Davis (1991, p.158) argues it is commonly claimed that local government is created by the States but has no constitutional recognition. However, the reality is that many day-to-day planning decisions, such as siting of facilities and amenities, road construction and the provision of parks and reserves, are taken by local government. Galligan, Hughes & Walsh (1991, p158) observe the role local government plays in environmental management is missing in current studies. However, the national government has become increasingly involved in State environmental issues. This has posed dangers to State rights, resulting in High Court challenges but these have, in fact, reinforced national powers (Galligan, Hughes & Walsh (1991, p151). The national government is powerful in the setting of macroeconomic parameters but the States dominate the detailed formulation and implementation of policy with respect to the delivery of services. Mathews (1976, p.22) considers that since WWII the national government has played a greater role in state and local government financial affairs through the provision of conditional grants.

Wiltshire (1976, p.116) contends the States strongly oppose any attempts for them to surrender their responsibility for local government and this is a problem when local government receives grants directly from the national government. States are extremely centralist and local government is seen as a creature of the State and not as a legally entrenched third level of government. The national government sees the States as administrative organisations for national government policies while the States view their respective local governments in the same way.
When the Whitlam Government was elected in 1972 it pursued regional programmes to bypass the States though a new Department of Urban and Regional Development (DURD). The programmes were largely of a physical nature but with some social planning overtones through such policies as area improvement programs, land commissions and urban transport systems (Wiltshire 1976, p.158). Miles (1976, pp.177-1987) takes the view the Whitlam Government believed it should be involved in the governance of cities because that is where most people live in Australia and that financial aid from the national government was needed to improve the local environment. For legal and historical reasons the States opposed any such involvement by the Whitlam Government.

Miles (1976, p.174) also asserts local government was created by the States as a means of requiring communities to meet some of the costs of basic local work. However, he argues the community recognises the importance of local government as the protector of the local environment, particularly against actions proposed by the state and national governments. Local government is also seen as the basic unit of physical planning by the States and in terms of governance it is not surprising that the States are always trying to reduce the number of local governments (Cutt 1976, p.161). While federalism is based on a division of powers, local government is becoming a more significant political force as the demands of local communities continue to grow, and important decisions are increasingly made at the local level (Else-Mitchell 1976, pp. 198-202).

Apart from the period of the Whitlam Labor government as mentioned, the national government has had little direct involvement in local government. It is contended this is mainly because of the constitutional position that local government is a creature of the States and the States continue to exercise power and control over local government. Badcock (2002, p.226) observes States can dismiss local governments in Australia and have often done so, particularly the City of Sydney in New South Wales and the City of Melbourne in Victoria.

In this Section the overall governance arrangements in Australia have been reviewed. This provides a framework for a more detailed analysis of City/State governance in the capital cities (except Adelaide) in the 1970s and their respective approaches to strategic and statutory city planning. In the next Sections planning in the capital cities of Australia, and the national capital Canberra, will be examined as a background to the evaluation of Adelaide in Part Three of the thesis to show its uniqueness.
In the City of Brisbane the Brisbane City Council (BCC) was established by the *City of Brisbane Act*, 1925. It was set up as a single authority for the metropolitan area by amalgamating twenty smaller bodies. This gave the BCC considerable capacity to plan and coordinate works in support of its own urban expansion until urban development extended beyond the city’s boundaries (Toms, 1976; Brisbane Queensland Government, 2009). The first *Town Plan of the City of Brisbane, 1966* was adopted on 21 December 1965 in accordance with *The City of Brisbane Town Planning Act, 1964*. This was a statutory plan for regulating development in the city but it did establish a direction for growth and remained in effect until 1978.

The hierarchy of planning controls in Queensland is such that the plan of a local authority, including the BCC, must sit within the State’s relevant Regional Plan. The South East Queensland Regional Plan is the State’s statutory scheme covering Brisbane. In terms of governance a local authority planning scheme must provide for and comply with all of the higher level State provisions and the BCC is no exception. Any proposed amendment to a Town Plan or a new Town Plan requires a Council to submit the proposals to the State Planning Minister before undertaking any public consultation. This allows the Minister to consider the proposals in terms of the State’s interests. Any proposals amended by the Council after public consultation must again be forwarded to the Minister for review. The Council can only adopt the amended or new Town Plan after approval by the Minister (T Richardson 2009, pers. comm., 20 January).

The State, through these reviews by the Planning Minister of proposed amendments to planning schemes by the BCC, ensures that the relevant Regional Plan and other State legislation and issues are given due consideration by the BCC before they can be approved. The State changed the Act in 1971 and required the BCC to prepare a new plan for the city by February 1974 which had to include a Statement of Intent, planning policies and relevant ordinances (Cole 1984, p.292).

However, Lord Mayor Clem Jones did not want the BCC constrained in its capacity to negotiate with developers. He persuaded the State to extend the period to February 1975, arguing that additional planning staff was needed to prepare the draft plan. The Planning Department was dominated by engineers and no other specialist advice was brought to bear on the draft plan and when it was exhibited in March 1975 there was a storm of public protest (Cole 1984, p.294).
Cole asserts the 1975 Statement of Intent was little more than a pre-meditated political document to test the resolve of the State. There were over 29,000 objections and the draft plan was severely criticised leading to its withdrawal by the BCC. A new Director of Town Planning (Phil Fletcher) was appointed to revise the plan and he approached this task as a corporate planning exercise. The new draft plan was much more orientated to meeting the environmental needs of the residents rather than catering for developers (Cole 1984, p.295). This draft plan went on display in September 1976 and was forwarded to the State in December 1976. Minister Russell Hinze and government officials considered it for over two years and the Town Plan, 1978 was finally gazetted in December 1978 in accordance with both the City of Brisbane Town Planning Act, 1964 and the Amendment Act, 1977 (ibid, p.296).

There was some integration of strategic and statutory approaches in the Town Plan, 1978 as a clearly defined structure plan provided the statutory framework for determining which land uses would be permitted in particular zones. But it also provided a strategic planning direction for the city which would shape Brisbane into the 1980s (C Newman 2008, pers. comm., 16 October). In terms of governance Cole (1984, p.408) asserts the Queensland Government sees the BCC as just one of the State’s local authorities for which it has ultimate responsibility.

In this Section it has been contended that although the Brisbane City Council is large and politically powerful, its ability to plan for the city remains limited by the powers of the State. The nature of planning in Canberra will be described in the next Section.

1.4.10 PLANNING IN THE CITY OF CANBERRA, NATIONAL CAPITAL

Planning in the national capital, the City of Canberra, was researched and examined but the information is not included in this Chapter because in terms of governance it came to be recognised there was no state/local government relationship in the 1970s. Thus there is no valid comparison with the situations in the other capital cities. However, it is considered the research work regarding planning in Canberra is of interest and is therefore included in Appendix 6. The situation in the City of Darwin, Northern Territory is examined in the next Section.
In the City of Darwin the Darwin City Council (DCC) has a very limited role in planning the city. In the early 1970s there was no Northern Territory government (Territory). Darwin was very much dominated by public servants as the area of the Northern Territory was administered directly by the Commonwealth Government. While there were some building controls, there were no planning controls (P Lindwall 2008, pers. comm., 17 September).

Darwin was devastated in December 1974 by Cyclone Tracy. After the cyclone Prime Minister Whitlam announced special funds to cover the cost of rebuilding Darwin and he established a Darwin Reconstruction Commission. There was a view that all options should be considered for rebuilding the city and some planners of the DCC and Territory proposed resiting Darwin and relocating the airport. However, the political decision was to rebuild Darwin on its existing site, albeit with new building codes for cyclone prone areas (Northern Territory Government Tracy, 2009). The opportunity for an integration of strategic and statutory approaches to replanning Darwin was lost and by mid 1978 the city was essentially rebuilt in its pre Cyclone Tracy form. The Darwin Reconstruction Commission was wound up and the first autonomous government for the Northern Territory was elected (Northern Territory Government, 2009).

It is asserted the planning situation in Darwin is at one extreme of governance between an upper and lower level of government. Since its creation the Territory has not permitted the City Council to have a role in the strategic planning of the central area of Darwin and only a limited input into statutory planning (Northern Territory Government, 2009). The opportunity existed after Cyclone Tracy in the mid 1970s for an integration of statutory and strategic planning approaches in the City of Darwin, albeit by only one level of government, but the opportunity was missed.

The Territory’s Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) has total control of the planning process. It is responsible for the preparation and implementation of the Northern Territory Planning Scheme which includes Darwin. But from the point of view of governance, the only role for the lower level of government, the DCC, is to provide comment on development applications within the city. These comments are taken into account by the upper level of government, the Territory (through the DPI), when determining the application in terms of the statutory scheme (P Lindwall 2008, pers. comm., 17 September).
In this Section it has been argued power over the planning function is exercised by the upper level government, the Territory; there is only some limited input into statutory planning from the lower level, the Darwin City Council. The planning situation in the City of Hobart, Tasmania will be examined in the next Section.

1.4.12 PLANNING IN THE CITY OF HOBART, TASMANIA

In the City of Hobart the Hobart City Council (HCC) administered building regulations of the Tasmanian State government (State) as the only controls until a statutory planning scheme for the Sandy Bay area of the city was prepared in 1966. The HCC engaged Clarke, Gazzard Partners (architects and planners in Sydney) to prepare a statutory planning scheme for another part of the city, Battery Point, in 1969. Both of these statutory schemes were without a strategic approach thus there was no integration and no means proposed for their implementation.

UDPA Planners (consultants in Sydney) were engaged in 1973 to carry out a planning study for the city. The objectives of the study were to conserve and enhance the environmental quality of the city; to encourage within the city the central functions of the State; and to protect the city’s residential communities (R Broughton 2009, pers. comm., 19 January).

The consultants had meetings with a wide range of community groups and there was public support for maintaining the beauty of the setting of the city but concerns about the impact of proposed freeways and a decline in inner city housing. It was recommended in the planning study that the city continue to be the “central place” for state facilities, colonial architecture was to be retained wherever possible and neighbourhoods were to have a sense of identity.

The HCC adopted the consultants’ recommendations and the City of Hobart Planning Scheme, 1973 came into effect. In terms of governance the scheme had to be approved by the State through the Commissioner for Town and Country Planning (B Holmes 2008, pers. comm., 19 December). It was a statutory scheme with the traditional coloured zoning maps for 19 zones, including four residential zones. There were defined complying and non-complying uses and car parking standards. However, Action Plans were proposed for four areas: a mixed residential and commercial zone around the

---

18 Further reference is made to George Clarke in Section 3.1.2.
Theatre Royal; comprehensive redevelopment in North Hobart as existing block sizes were very small; new shopping and off-street parking in Condell Place; and the provision of a range of community activities in Mount Nelson Community Centre. Thus there was a limited attempt to implement the statutory plan (R Broughton 2009, pers. comm., 19 January).

In 1979 the HCC established a new Department of City Planning as it recognised strategic planning was becoming common in the other capital cities and there needed to be integration between such an approach and the HCC statutory planning scheme. But the lower level of government (HCC) was still subject to control by the upper level of government (State). The single Commissioner was subsequently replaced by a Resource Planning and Development Commission and this Commission retains responsibility, on behalf of the State, for governance in terms of planning the city (B Holmes 2008, pers. comm., 19 December).

It has been argued in this Section that in the 1970s planning in the City of Hobart was still controlled by the State and there was no integration of strategic and statutory approaches. The planning situation in the City of Melbourne, Victoria, will be examined in the next Section.

1.4.13 PLANNING IN THE CITY OF MELBOURNE, VICTORIA

In the City of Melbourne in the 1970s the Melbourne City Council (MCC) was subject to the Victorian State government’s (State) *Town and Country Planning (Metropolitan Area) Act, 1949*. Sandercock asserts that the issue of governance between state and local governments presented problems in the conservative Legislative Council when it came to establishing any form of planning authority by the Victorian Parliament (Sandercock 1975a, p.76). The main thrust of the Act was to allow, but not compel, councils to prepare planning schemes which would indicate where specific uses could locate with an emphasis on zoning to achieve order (Logan 1981, p.107). However, because councils did not have enough qualified planning resources the Act also established the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works (MMBW) (McLoughlin 1992, p.25). The MMBW became a very powerful body because it was not only responsible for the provision of services (water supply, sewerage, main drainage, metropolitan parks, and metropolitan main roads) but it was also the Regional Planning Authority for the metropolitan area which included the City of Melbourne (M Williams 2008, pers. comm., 17 April).
Dunstan (1984) reviews governing the Melbourne metropolitan area in the last half of the 19th century while Davison (1978) describes the various stages of the development of Melbourne into a metropolitan city. It grew by dispersion supported by a public transport system rather than concentration. The middle-class generally left their two-storey townhouses for more individually-designed homes and gardens in the suburbs. But the working-class remained living as close as possible to the CBD because that was where labour was recruited.

This situation continued until after WWII but then there was a loss of residents from the city. Logan (1985, p.179 citing Castells1977) argues it is beyond the capability of local government to ensure the survival of working class communities in the inner suburbs by using conventional planning and policy-making procedures, or to enhance working class residential environments without immediately making them prone to gentrification. Thus a state agency, the Victorian Housing Commission (VHC), was encouraged by the MCC to undertake 'slum' clearance and provide public housing (Logan 1985, p.156). The VHC had a substantial social and spatial impact over a twenty year period as some 81 hectares of inner city land was redeveloped. However, the MMBW and MCC were ignored by the VHC which simply advised these two bodies of its redevelopment intentions as a matter of courtesy (Logan 1985, p.157).

In 1959 the MCC appointed a Town Planning Officer (Borrie) to prepare a statutory plan as the only development controls were the Uniform Building Regulations. Borrie was formerly the Chief Planner of the MMBW and thus it was inevitable the thinking of the MMBW was brought to the MCC in its early approaches to planning (Logan 1985, p.51). The Town Clerk of the MCC (Rogan) became concerned about differences between the Council, MMBW and the VHC in relation to the governance of the city, particularly the Housing Commission's redevelopment plans which were prepared without consulting the MCC. This became a struggle and the MCC tacitly sought the support of its own residents to stop the VHC. When a scheme was proposed for Carlton within the city in 1965 there was considerable opposition from traders and residents who became well organised and eventually stopped the proposal. The VHC agreed to submit its future schemes to the Council for approval (Logan 1985, p.239).

The report The Future Growth of Melbourne, 1967 by the MMBW gave consideration to three basic patterns for growth – corridors, controlled outward growth, and satellite cities (MMBW, 1967). The preferred option was a mix of the three with wedges for agricultural and recreational purposes preserved between the radial urban corridors (Logan 1981, p.28). There was public criticism of the
plan in that it was just a statutory land use “colours on a map” restriction without any integration with a strategic approach. Despite such opposition, the statutory metropolitan plan was gazetted in 1968 with the Melbourne Central Business District designated as the Central City Zone. However, the MMBW delegated to the MCC all its statutory responsibilities in terms of development control (MMBW, 1968).

Sandercock asserts that the City Council had allowed land and office speculation and development because of increased revenue for the Council. She points to the important role of insurance companies, property developers and architects in the property boom, but this accelerated the demolition of historic buildings. The MCC had favoured high rise development over low income terrace house dwellers. It had supported freeway plans because they would enhance the prosperity of the CBD (Sandercock 1975a, p.159). Logan (1985, p.135) argues the MCC was concerned with the promotion of economic growth and prosperity for the CBD in the early 1970s. The MCC was made up of three groups: the Australian Labor Party (ALP), the Civic Group and Independents; but it was dominated by the Civic Group, a conservative faction which represented business and property interests with affinities to the State Liberal government. Retailing, wholesaling and manufacturing functions declined in the CBD as the city expanded at the fringes (Logan 1981, p.45). There was a substantial growth in offices with an escalation of CBD property values. The MCC could grant approval for demolition without a replacement use and such sites were then usually used for “temporary” car parks (Logan 1985, p.46).

In the early 1970s the Minister for Local Government (Hamer) believed the CBD was in danger of becoming dull and lifeless and he encouraged the MCC to prepare a strategy plan. He wanted a plan which would make Melbourne “a colourful, 24 hour-a-day living city” (Logan 1981, p.51). Logan (1985, p.136) asserts the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce prompted the Minister to take this action. Logan describes the ‘gentrification’ of inner Melbourne. There was a displacement of vulnerable groups as they moved out to locations where there were higher social costs, remoteness from work and a lack of social and cultural facilities (Logan 1985, p.75). Logan argues gentrification suited the State and the Civic Group of the MCC and it was encouraged out of concern for the city’s finances (Logan 1985, p.162). There was a rise of resident groups whose members were affluent and well-educated (the ‘gentry’) and there were pressures to retain historic buildings and the quality of the environment. Davison observes the Historic Buildings Act, 1974 established the Historic Buildings Council of Victoria which was a mixed body of experts and lay people who were able to balance
professional and public judgement about the historic importance of a building and its retention (Davison 1986, pp 2-4).

The MCC had a long history of architects as Councillors and in the early 1970s they supported the push by Minister Hamer for the MCC to have a strategy plan as one had already been prepared for Sydney\(^{19}\) and the Adelaide City Council was also advertising for international consultants to prepare one for Adelaide.\(^{20}\) The Interplan group was formed specifically to respond to the call for expressions of interest by the MCC. It was led by Donald Wolbrink, and included architect Peter McIntyre (M Williams 2008, pers. comm., 17 April).

Logan (1985, p.266) observes Interplan consisted of Wolbrink & Associates (North America); Indecon (North America); G C Conner & Associates (Melbourne) and McIntyre & McIntyre (local Melbourne architects). There were some misgivings about the North American bias and transport planning background of the consultants but Interplan grappled with the need for a rational, systematic approach with public participation leading to objectives, policy guidelines, strategies for implementation and detailed action plans (Logan 1981, p.53). Interplan highlighted the undesirable effects of the office boom, traffic and parking congestion, and streets that lacked adequate parks, landscaping and weather protection (ibid, p.54). Four options were proposed: maximum centralised growth; growth proportional to the metropolitan area with an increase in employment but a residential decline; specialised growth of some functions with a diverse population and preservation of buildings; and maximum decentralisation which was essentially a ‘no growth’ option.

Logan (1981, p.54 citing Interplan 1974, p.262) asserts the MCC supported the specialised growth option because it would enhance the variety, compactness and accessibility of the city. The *Strategy Plan* attempted to relate physical controls over development to economic and social processes. But in trying to move away from rigid controls and consequent uniformity of development it became a highly complex document which partly explains the inadequate attempts to implement it (Logan 1981, p.58).

Logan (1985, p.137) contends that Peter McIntyre, a principal of Interplan, was an individual of influence because of his links with the architectural and planning professions and the middle class residents. Consequently the draft *Strategy Plan* was sympathetic to the needs and desires of the

\(^{19}\) Refer to Section 1.4.14 in this Chapter.
\(^{20}\) Refer to Section 3.1.2 in Chapter 3.1.
gentry. Citizens see it as a basic right to be involved in the planning process and do not want it left to elected members or appointed officials (Logan 1981, p.113). Logan (1981, p.114 citing Sandercock, 1975b) asserts that the public who do participate in the planning process have the education and time as well as access to professional expert advice. But this does not mean that planning agencies should abandon public participation – they should strive to overcome the difficulties.

When the Interplan draft *Strategy Plan* was released the editorial in *The Age* on 31 October 1973 described it as “a blueprint for the new greening of old Melbourne”. Logan asserts that all the aspirations of the middle class residents had been met in the draft *Strategy Plan* (Logan 1985, p.173). Resident political action reached a climax in Melbourne with its input into the *Strategy Plan* and its concerns for protection against external threats as represented by the State through its agency the MMBW (ibid, p.299). The principles of the Interplan draft *Strategy Plan* were adopted by the MCC as the *City of Melbourne Strategy Plan, 1974*. The need to maintain the inner residential area for medium density living and protect the existing stock of buildings was stressed. Logan (1985, p.148) asserts the City Council saw gentrification as a means to protect the residential areas and regenerate the inner city.

The State quickly organized an Interim Development Order (IDO) to control development until a new statutory plan could be gazetted. Approvals were issued in terms of the *Melbourne Planning Scheme* by the Council acting under delegation from the MMBW, and by the MCC itself under its own IDO. The decisions were identical but issued by different authorities even though they were usually signed by the same Council officer (M Williams 2008, pers. comm., 17 April). Because of a lack of integration between the statutory provisions of the MMBW’s scheme and the MCC’s strategic approach there were many appeals against decisions and the *Strategy Plan* was found to have no legal status (Logan 1981, p.57).

Once government takes steps to improve residential environments they become more attractive to higher status buyers, gentrification occurs more rapidly, values rise and rates increase thus a council gets its investment back (Logan 1985, p.129). The pro-development Civic Group, supported by businessmen and property owners, endorsed the *Strategy Plan* as it set out guidelines for the central city within which they could operate, establishing a stable context for future profit making (Logan 1985, p.149). Badcock (2002, p.81) argues business elites are able to cultivate close links with City Hall because investment brings higher rate income. Sites values fall when economic activity declines.
and thus the land is undercapitalised but banks are prepared to lend to developers who want to redevelop CBD sites, often accompanied with concessions from City Hall.

Some property owners in the CBD fringe and along St Kilda Road objected to the *Strategy Plan* because of restrictions on what they could do and there was a pro-conservation stance on private property rights. There was criticism of the *Strategy Plan* in that it failed to offer practical solutions to achieve greater equity of access to existing housing and there was a strong bias in favour of residents through development controls (Logan 1985, p.167).

The MMBW was opposed to the *City of Melbourne Strategy Plan, 1974* and saw the MCC as trying to establish too great a planning role and control over the city at the MMBW’s expense. The Chairman of the MMBW (Alan Croxford) worked energetically through political channels to ensure the MMBW maintained its position as the dominant planning authority, and not the MCC, for Melbourne (Logan 1985, p.259). In November 1975 Minister Hamer, as a matter of governance, reminded the City Council its *Strategy Plan* was required to fit in with State policies (through the MMBW) and it had failed to do so. Rogan, on behalf of the MCC, interviewed representatives of Interplan who admitted they had nothing in writing from the MMBW to support their draft *Strategy Plan* and indeed the MMBW had expressed the view that it was often not in agreement with what was being proposed by Interplan (Logan 1985, p.243).

Logan asserts the *Strategy Plan* failed not because the MCC was unscrupulous, but because Interplan and the MCC were inept and did not recognise the governance issue with the State (Logan 1985, p.257). The Minister made it clear the MCC was not the prime planning authority for the city; it was the State’s responsibility and thus the MCC lacked the effective power to enforce its decisions against the wishes of the upper level of government planning authority (ibid, p.244).

Town Clerk Rogan and City Planner Jack Williams were individuals who had influence within the MCC because of their technical expertise and long experience of the bureaucracy. They were able to control the flow of information to Councillors and could effectively veto MCC decisions through inaction. Williams had little involvement with Interplan in the preparation of the *Strategy Plan*, but he saw its adoption as a means to increase the status of his City Planning Department within the MCC. Williams proposed a joint City/State committee in late 1976 to try and prepare a common approach
between the MCC and MMBW but it never eventuated. The Minister advised the MCC it was no different from any other Council. It was a matter of governance, and the MCC would have to comply with the provisions of the *Town and Country Planning Act*, which meant the MCC was subject to the MMBW’s statutory plan (Logan 1985, pp. 246-49).

Mcloughlin (1992, p.183) observes the City of Melbourne, as the core of the metropolitan area, has always been one of the highest-profile land-use planning issues. There have always been conflicts, often severe, between the State, the MMBW and the MCC over the governance of the city. Logan argues that the MMBW and the MCC were not able to agree on the extent to which development should be concentrated in the central city as opposed to the suburbs (Logan 1981, p.59).

By February 1978 the MCC had produced a document which indicated all the changes that would have to be made to the *Strategy Plan* for it to comply with the MMBW plan and therefore acceptable to the State in terms of an integration of a strategic and statutory approach. The City Council therefore sought a statutory amendment to the MMBW scheme to incorporate the *Strategy Plan*. Logan (1981, p.57) asserts the Amendment (No.96) was exhibited in early 1978 but it had no public input, was poorly conceived and hard to understand. Thus after considerable public objection and criticism it was withdrawn in 1979.

The *Town and Country Planning (Amendment) Act, 1979* enabled the MMBW to include a statement of objectives in its statutory scheme and thus there was the beginning of an integration of strategic planning with statutory planning but all Councils in Victoria, including the MCC, still had to conform to the State’s metropolitan policies in terms of governance (Logan 1981, p.40)

Towards the end of the 1970s the State became increasingly concerned about decisions the MCC was taking, influenced by residents, which were perceived by the State to be adversely affecting the CBD. Consequently, in December 1980 the State exerted its governance role and dismissed the MCC, replacing it with three Commissioners and there was a marked shift away from conservation towards development (Logan 1985, p.363).

In this Section the importance of governance in the planning of the City of Melbourne has been examined. There was a lack of integration between strategic and statutory approaches and the State,

---

21 Williams and the researcher were members of the Capital City Planners’ Working Group where the situation in each city was regularly discussed. Williams was aware of the joint City/State City of Adelaide Development Committee.
not the Council, controlled what happened in the City through the MMBW statutory plan. Planning in the City of Perth, Western Australia will be addressed in the next Section.

1.4.14 PLANNING IN THE CITY OF PERTH, WESTERN AUSTRALIA

In the City of Perth, the Perth City Council (PCC) decided to establish a Department of Planning early in 1964. Paul Ritter published *Planning for man and motor* in the same year and it received much critical acclaim from the planning profession for its advocacy of separating pedestrians from cars (Gregory 2003, p.135). Ritter was appointed to the newly created position of City Planner and he took up the position late in 1964. 22 A year later, in 1965, David Carr was appointed as the Chief Planner of the Western Australia state government’s (State) Metropolitan Region Planning Authority (MRPA). The MRPA had been created in 1963 to convert the *Plan for the Metropolitan region* (Stephenson & Hepburn, 1955) into a statutory scheme which covered the City of Perth (Gregory 2003, p.105).

Ritter and Carr were both individuals of influence and they soon fell out when it became clear the State’s view of governance was that the role of the PCC was simply to fill in the detail of the metropolitan plan for the city (Gregory 2003, p.141). To lift the profile of planning Ritter had courted the media and he enjoyed public support but within the Council he had an uneasy relationship with the Town Clerk and other Heads of Departments. There was also growing concern amongst the Councillors that Ritter was failing in his task of producing the statutory scheme required for the city by Carr and the MRPA. Ritter’s services as City Planner were terminated by the Council in July 1967 (Gregory 2003, p.148).

Eric Sabin was appointed as the new City Planner and it took six years, until 1973, for the draft statutory planning scheme to be submitted. Gregory (2003, p.180) contends this was due to the continuing discord between the PCC and the State about governance and the fear the PCC had about the MRPA’s role in planning the city. From the MRPA’s point of view the Perth City Council had a very narrow view of the city’s development and it took another four years, until 1977, for the proposed scheme to go on public display. 23 There was then considerable discussion between the PCC and the MRPA about governance and the nature of the city. It was not until 1984 that the Council proposed a

---

22 See Minutes of the meeting of the Perth City Council held on 6 June 1964, p.651.
23 Personal information obtained from Eric Sabin in 1977 when he and the researcher were both members of the Capital City Planners’ Working Group.
strategic approach with a set of objectives and policies for the central city to supplement the statutory scheme.

It has been asserted in this Section that the integration of strategic and statutory planning in Perth was not achieved until 1985 when the city plan was finally agreed by the State and adopted by the City Council (Gregory 2003, p.255). Planning in the City of Sydney, New South Wales, will be examined in some detail in the next Section because of relevant connections to planning in Adelaide and the influence of key individuals.

1.4.15 PLANNING IN THE CITY OF SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

The history of the City of Sydney is of interest in terms of governance and the relationship between the Government of New South Wales (State) and the Council of the City of Sydney (SCC). The State created the city in November 1842 and established the structure of the SCC and its boundaries (Golder 2004, p.vii). In 1853, the State dismissed the elected SCC and placed the city under the control of unelected Commissioners because it was concerned that basic services were not being provided (Robson 1957, p.577). Ashton (1993, p.10) asserts conflict and power have been the dominant themes in the planning of Sydney. The struggle for governance between the State and the SCC demonstrates the connection between social and spatial outcomes and the city's political economy. A conservative State government dismissed the Labor controlled SCC in 1927 and the reasons given were that the SCC was open to bribery and corruption and the city was being badly administered (Golder 2003, p.45). The three appointed Commissioners reduced expenditure and improved efficiency by reducing the workforce and simplifying the administrative structure. The State passed the Sydney Corporation (Amendment) Act, 1929 which gave the vote to non-resident property owners and changed the ward boundaries which ensured the Labor party did not win the 1930 election (Golder 2003, p.96).

The Local Government (Town and Country Planning) Act, 1945 established the Cumberland County Council which had responsibility for preparing a planning scheme to apply to all local authorities within the County, including the City of Sydney. In terms of governance the State was not prepared to give the local governments within the County the power to determine their own destinies and controlled the statutory plan within which the Councils had to operate (Robson 1957, p.593). However, Councils were obliged to produce local statutory land use zoning plans which would provide detail for the
County master plan (Ashton 1993, p.67). The statutory *Cumberland County Planning Scheme, 1951* was prescribed and remained in operation until 1971, primarily because the SCC failed to produce a detailed zoning scheme for the city and there was ongoing conflict with the State in the form of the County Council (Ashton 1993, p.68). But there were also limited resources in the SCC with only a small town planning branch within the City Engineer’s Department. The SCC adopted a draft scheme prepared by the City Engineer in 1952 which included five expressways converging on the central city with off-street parking stations tied a system of distributor roads (Ashton 1993, p. 73).

Concerns began to be expressed about the *laissez-faire* approach to development in the city in the 1950s, particularly by Denis Winston (Professor of Town Planning at the University of Sydney) in relation to the height and bulk of buildings (*Australian Planning Institute Bulletin*, December 1956, p.4). The State’s response was to create another authority, the Height of Buildings Advisory Committee (HOBAC), to which any development application for a building over 80 feet (23.4m) in height had to be submitted. Ashton (1993, p. 73) asserts the complex web of power relations in the *laissez-faire* approach ensured the State’s dominant governance over the control and development of the city. In 1963 the Government established the State Planning Authority (SPA) to replace the Cumberland County Council and one of its main tasks was to review draft schemes submitted by Councils. The SCC submitted a further draft scheme in October 1964 but in December 1964 the Minister, on the advice of the SPA, released his own draft scheme for the city with very major amendments including provision for the expressways, street widening and changes to the areas zoned for residential use. The Minister took a political decision to have a statutory planning scheme for the city in place before the State elections in 1965 (Ashton 1992, p.72).

In November 1967 Commissioners were again appointed to run the city after the SCC was dismissed. But this time it was for purely political reasons with the newly elected conservative (Liberal-Country Party) State government removing an elected Labor SCC after the State had directed the Boundaries Commission to determine new limits for a smaller city (Ashton 1993, p 88; Golder 2004, p. vii). The three Commissioners appointed were Vernon Treatt (a former leader of the Liberal party and former chair of the Boundaries Commission), John Shaw (who had recently retired as the Commissioner of Main Roads) and Bill Pettingell (a prominent businessman and former President of the NSW Chamber of Manufacturers) (Ashton 1993, p.92; Golder 2004, p.128). Sydney was experiencing a property boom and the Commissioners, appointed by a “development-at-all-costs” State, approved applications at an unprecedented rate (Golder 2004, pp 138-145).
The governance of Sydney returned to a democratically elected SCC in September 1969 when the election was won by the Civic Reform Association (CRA) based on the new boundaries for the smaller central city as shown in Figure 3. The CRA had been formed in 1921 as a group of citizens and ratepayers concerned about the influence of the Labor party in City Hall (Briger in Webber 1988 p.35). Ashton asserts that architect Andrew Briger and engineer Leo Port were individuals who exerted influence within the CRA in the late 1960s and subsequently within the SCC in the 1970s (Ashton 1993, p. 91). They persuaded the CRA that an entirely new process for planning the City should be a major plank in their electoral platform for the 1969 elections (Golder 2004, p.146). Freestone (2010, p.268) contends Briger and Port were critical in creating a new climate for design initiatives in Sydney.

NOTE: This figure is included on page 79 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 3 – The boundaries of the City of Sydney in 1971
Source: The City of Sydney Strategic Plan, 1971 p.29

George Clarke had substantial individual influence in Sydney (and later in Adelaide as will be discussed in Chapter 3.1 of this thesis). Clarke was trained as an architect at Sydney University and under the influence of Winston began an interest in urban affairs. Clarke obtained a Diploma in Town Planning from London University and a Master’s Degree in City Planning from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. During the early 1960s he studied and worked in Italy, France, England and
the USA. On his return to Sydney he became a principal of the firm Clarke, Gazzard and Partners.\textsuperscript{24} On Clarke’s death in 2005 the Lord Mayor of Sydney, Clover Moore, described him as a “community activist and visionary”.\textsuperscript{25} A colleague, Jim Colman, described Clarke as having “a towering ego, boundless energy, prodigious curiosity, ferocious intellect and a passion for urban planning”.\textsuperscript{26} Briger (in Webber 1988, p.43) described him as “a man of intense passion; dedicated, almost bordering on the fanatic; articulate and persuasive; and who understood the role politics played in planning”.

Clarke wrote to Briger proposing the concept of a strategic plan for the City after the CRA won the 1969 election.\textsuperscript{27} Clarke then prepared a report for Briger in October 1969 on the differences between statutory and strategic planning in support of his proposal.\textsuperscript{28} Clarke explained the differences as:

- A Statutory Planning Scheme is a collection of broadly expressed and greatly simplified land use regulations and restrictions which are imposed by law on an area, through gazettal of an Ordinance, in an attempt to prevent the worst kind of development from being carried out.

- A Strategic Plan is a policy document which expresses the highest objectives which can be attained for an area and describes the plans, performance standards and programmes which must be implemented to attain those objectives.

Briger used Clarke’s advice and with the support of his colleagues Port and [Sir] Nicholas Shehadie the Council decided in December 1969 to commission a “strategic master plan” for the City.\textsuperscript{29} Shehadie (Shehadie, Nick, ohi 13/10:16, Sydney, 30 November 2007) recalls the influence of Briger and Port in the planning and development of the City:

- Because of what they wanted to do for Sydney, the rest of the Civic Reform Aldermen were convinced by Andrew and Leo that there was a need for a strategic master plan for the City. The Lord Mayor raised the issue in one of our party room meetings and it was decided that this should go ahead. A Strategic Planning Committee was appointed consisting of Andrew, Leo and me.

Briger and Port then sought the assistance of Clarke in the preparation of the Brief for a consultancy to prepare a strategic plan (Briger 1988, p 49).

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item George Clarke Personal Papers, Box 14, 1970, Item 40.
\item See Lord Mayor's Minute to the Sydney City Council on 11 March 2005.
\item As expressed in a tribute to Clarke at a Lord Mayoral memorial dinner held in Adelaide on 6 September 2005.
\item George Clarke Personal Papers, Box 13, 1969, Item 88.
\item George Clarke Personal Papers, Box 13, 1969, Item 90.
\item See Minutes of the meeting of the Sydney City Council 15 December 1969.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The Editorial in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 5 November 1969 when the preparation of a strategic plan was announced by the CRA (but before there was a formal SCC decision) stated with some insight:

> If the plan is to be effective then it will require the cooperation of many other bodies, from State Government departments and boards down to the State Planning Authority and the Height of Buildings Committee. This is the heart of the Council’s problem – so many decisions are made by other authorities.

The consultancy was advertised internationally in January 1970. Clarke had learned informally from Briger and Port that a sum of $100,000 had been allocated for the consultancy and Clarke put together a team with a proposal to do the work for $99,967 (Ashton 1992, p. 38). Clarke, with his partner Gazzard, formed a new entity, Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd, as the primary consultant. Conybeare asserts Clarke had an incredible ability to pull together a group of people appropriate for the job and he also had good political acumen. Conybeare (Conybeare, Darrel, ohi 16 / 11:15, Sydney, 24 October 2007) also provides advice on the fee and the consortium:

> Planning commissions at the time were running at about $10,000 so the amount of $100,000 for the strategic plan was a lot of money. George managed to appoint McConnel Smith & Johnson (architects) and W D Scott (management consultants) as part of his team when he applied for the Sydney job.

The Council received 21 submissions to undertake the study and five firms were selected for interview. Briger was concerned at the political implications of Clarke having been involved in the preparation of the Brief. Briger personally consulted with Winston, Nigel Ashton (Chairman of the SPA) and John Overall (Chairman of the NCDC). All three expressed the view that Clarke and his team were the best qualified to do the job (Briger in Webber 1988, p.50). Shehadie (Shehadie, Nick, ohi 13 / 18:21, Sydney, 30 November 2007) also recalls Clarke’s selection:

> The Council advertised for consultants to assist Civic Reform with the preparation of the strategic master plan. George Clarke’s name came up as he was well known to Andrew and Leo. After an interview process, George’s team was selected. So that is how the strategic plan started.

The consortium of Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd; McConnel, Smith & Johnson, and W D Scott & Co. Pty Ltd were selected as the consultants in May 1970 and the contract with the SCC to prepare the “Strategic Master Plan” for the City of Sydney was signed on 10 August 1970. The planning team then had regular meetings in the Town Hall with the CRA Strategic Planning Committee, consisting of Briger, Port and Shehadie, during the 11-month period of the planning study.

---

Conybeare (Conybeare, Darrel, ohi 16 / 51:53, Sydney, 24 October 2007) asserts there was a considerable amount of pressure working on the Sydney plan with Clarke:

George’s office was so busy it was hard to keep on top of things. He had the ability to work until the last minute and then pull things together but this was an especially intense way of doing things. It was a constant battle to meet deadlines.

Shehadie (Shehadie, Nick, ohi 13 / 21:25, Sydney, 30 November 2007) recalls his own role and the nature of the working relationships:

I had to be the leveller in the team as while I was not a planner, I knew people. George, Andrew and Leo were all energetic, enthusiastic and influential individuals; the mixture was exciting at times, but at other times it was hard going.

Clarke had persuaded the CRA of the importance of involving the public in the planning process as well as having to have the professional expertise to undertake the technical studies. Clarke (1972) argued that planning was a social learning process that needed to involve the community in the constant review and revision of long term plans in the light of experience and action. Thus contact was made with public and private organisations representing hundreds of thousands of individuals in an effort to gain maximum involvement in setting the basic objectives and policies for the City. Sandercock (1975b, p.199) is critical of this process arguing planners use it simply to ensure that the interest groups could feel they were involved in the determination of the objectives. She asserts planners then point to the participation process as a means of legitimising the plan.

The draft headings of Accessibility, Environment, Diversity and Economics were used to ascertain the demands, needs and ideas of the public (SCC 1971, p. 13). Clarke subsequently described the work as initiating a new intra-governmental urban management process for continuous and integrated city planning and development through Objectives, Policies and Action Priorities (Ashton 1992, p.38).

Draft Objectives, Policies and Action Priorities were developed by the whole consultant team after much debate and many meetings. But Clarke exerted his individual influence and finalised them himself after meeting with the twelve CRA Aldermen (Ashton 1992, p.39). The City of Sydney Strategic Plan, 1971 as agreed by the CRA and Clarke was then adopted and published by the SCC. Webber (1988, p.25) asserted the City of Sydney Strategic Plan, 1971 was important because it recognised the SCC had a role to co-ordinate the multitude of public authorities and give direction to

---

31 As a member of the consultant team the researcher contributed to “Policy 8 – Pedestrians” based on his Master’s Thesis “The City Pedestrian Environment” and experienced firsthand Clarke’s influence and approach to working.

32 See Minutes of the Sydney City Council meeting on 21 July 1971.
development and change but Briger (1988, p.37) recognised that the City Council, in terms of governance, was the least influential of the relevant bodies within the State.

The politics of the planning process were evident during the preparation of the strategic plan with the timing of its adoption in July 1971 being critical so that it could be used as the major policy platform by the CRA in the elections to be held in September 1971. The three year review cycle adopted as part of the plan was clearly tied to the three-yearly local government terms in NSW. Briger (1988, p.36) while describing the review process as Systematic, Comprehensive, Continuous, Co-operative and Open, is quite explicit that the timing of plan reviews was tied to the SCC electoral cycle. The adoption of the Floor Space Ratio Code and Parking Code which were to be the “teeth” for the control of development under the plan, were deliberately delayed until after September 1971 election. Clarke, ever the political pragmatist, had agreed to the CRA’s request for this to maximise the “positive” impacts of the plan and obtain maximise public support before the “negative” aspects of development control were introduced (ibid, p. 51).

The Lord Mayor advised the State in early July 1969 about the imminent adoption of a strategic plan for the city by the SCC and this pushed the Minister of Local Government into action. After 24 years in the making the Minister finally gazetted the statutory *City of Sydney Planning Scheme, 1971* on 16 July 1971.33

In his Foreword to the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan, 1971* Lord Mayor Emmet McDermott wrote:

> We have set down objectives and policies which should guide and govern the systematic reshaping the city. We are trying to evolve, through a systematic process of investigation and consultation with interested authorities and independent groups, a series of priorities for action to improve our City.

The four adopted Objectives of the plan were Management (Economics in the draft headings), Accessibility, Diversity and Environment as shown in Figure 4.

A four page lift-out about the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan, 1971* was provided in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 22 July 1971 and subsequent editorials in the major daily papers in Sydney and the *Bulletin* were praiseworthy of the SCC plan (Briger 1988, p. 52). However, there was clearly no integration of the strategic approach by the Council with the statutory plan of the State.

33 See New South Wales Government Gazette no.78, 16 July 1971.
Clarke recommended that a separate City Planning Department with a new City Planner be established. But there was some politics in City Hall and within the CRA. What emerged was a renamed Building Surveying Department as the new City Planning and Building Department, with the Building Surveyor (John Doran) who had a planning qualification, becoming the City Planner. Within this there was a new Strategic Planning Branch with the position of Chief Planning Officer (CPO) as its head to manage the planning and architecture functions. Shehadie advises the CRA wanted an appropriately staffed and equipped City Planning Department to coordinate a program of action planning for the City. Shehadie (Shehadie, Nick, ohi 13/32:37, Sydney, 30 November 2007) recalls:

The CRA did not want to create a huge new Department, but felt it was so important for the City, which had never really been planned, to have a strategic approach. A new Branch was formed in the reconstituted Department headed by a new position of Chief Planning Officer.

Conybeare (Conybeare, Darrel, ohi 16/69:76, Sydney, 24 October 2007) has a view about Clarke’s role and influence in the appointment of the new CPO:

I remember George coming into my office and throwing all the curriculum vitae of the applicants across my desk. George said he had already made up his mind but what did I think? Clarke certainly had an influence with Briger and Port behind the scenes regarding this important appointment.

The CPO, with the political support of Briger, Port and Shehadie, set about establishing the new Strategic Planning Branch.\textsuperscript{34} The City Planner later commented that “the new members of the Branch introduced what was considered a rather bohemian attitude but they had a lot of good ideas and

\textsuperscript{34} The researcher was appointed as the Chief Planning Officer in December 1971 and took up the position in January 1972.
produced some very good work; it was staffed by university graduates including some professional women” (Ashton 1992, p.84; p.101). Briger (in Webber 1988, p.37) claims that the Strategic Planning Branch soon became the most qualified, innovative and forward thinking local government planning body in New South Wales, if not Australia. Ashton (1992, p.101) contends (and the researcher agrees) the first priority of the new Strategic Planning Branch was to implement the Strategic Plan through action plans which would indicate to observers and residents of the city that the SCC was doing something and things were happening. The political message from the CRA to the researcher was that the Action Planning program needed to be in place to demonstrate the SCC was serious about implementing the Strategic Plan, despite the problem that it was not a statutory document and that in terms of governance the State still had control of development in the city through the statutory City of Sydney Planning Scheme, 1971; the SPA and HOBAC.

Under the Strategic Plan the city was to be managed with a structure of five Districts and 32 Precincts, as shown in Figure 5. Each Precinct had a distinct role to play in the functioning of the city and Action Plans would contribute to the implementation of the plan.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 85 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 5 – The City of Sydney Structure
Source: City of Sydney Strategic Plan, 1971, p.79

Briger, in his role as Chairman of the City Development Committee, liaised with the planning staff and a budget of $200,000 was voted for the Action Planning programme, twice the consultant’s fee for the preparation of the original Strategic Plan. A total of 25 Action Plans were identified, all related to the relevant Policies and Action Priorities adopted by the SCC. Briger used his influence to determine the
spread of work between different consultants and the staff, and the amounts to be paid in fees. Clarke and Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd had expected to get all of this ongoing work but other firms with appropriate expertise and experience were engaged for some of the Action Plans. From Briger’s point of view it was a political decision to use the Action Plans to bring about change and maximise a positive impact on the community before the next SCC election in 1974.

Conybeare (Conybeare, Darrel, ohi 16/ 34:41 Sydney, 24 October 2007) contends in relation to change in the city and the influence of individuals:

While the Civic Reform Association was supposedly running the city none of the state bodies were going to give up their powers. But Briger, Port and Clarke were the right people, in the right place, at the right time. They were a team and firmly believed that through their influence they could bring about real change in the city.

The most significant of the Action Projects to be undertaken to bring about change was Woolloomooloo. In the Cumberland Planning Scheme, 1951 the area had been zoned “County Centre”. In the draft City of Sydney Planning Scheme, 1968 Woolloomooloo was designated as an “area for comprehensive redevelopment”. The Minister of Local Government requested the SPA to prepare a comprehensive plan and liaise with the City Commissioners. With no public involvement, although there were about 4,700 people living in the area, the Commissioners made their position clear; the existing housing was of a predominately low standard and not worth keeping as Woolloomooloo was not a good area for living (Golder 2004, p.134). A plan was prepared by the professional officers of the SPA which encouraged comprehensive redevelopment for commercial uses by giving generous floor space bonuses for site amalgamations. The plan was adopted by the Commissioners on 11 August 1969 just a few weeks before the SCC elections and it was to become a difficult legacy for the CRA (ibid, p.152).

Shehadie (Shehadie, Nick, ohi 13/ 39:42, Sydney, 30 November 2007) recalls Clarke had raised the planning issues of Woolloomooloo:

George had identified the problems of Woolloomooloo in the strategic plan. A study of Woolloomooloo had been prepared by the State Planning Authority for the former City Commissioners but the relationship between the suggested Floor Space Ratios, potential workforce and transportation capacity in the basin had not been appreciated.

The specialist traffic consultant from Britain for the Strategic Plan (Alan Proudlove of Shankland Cox) also had early concerns about the statutory zoning of Woolloomooloo, particularly in relation to its...
convenience to, but isolation from, the CBD of the city. Proudlove contended it should have residential and service uses, not be an extension of the CBD.\textsuperscript{35}

The argument was made in Action Priorities 2B and 2E (SCC 71, p.84; p.89) that the commercial redevelopment of Woolloomooloo would be at the expense of office growth in the southern part of the CBD where it could be serviced by public transport. The SPA study had envisaged a workforce of 35,000 based on a Floor Space Ratio (FSR) of 3.5, but the large site amalgamations could attract approvals with a FSR of 12.0 and a consequent workforce of up to 130,000 with enormous transport implications. Clarke therefore recommended that Woolloomooloo be re-established as much as possible in predominantly residential uses but with some commercial use allowed along the William Street Boulevard.

Private developers, such as Sidney Londish, had purchased a significant amount of land in Woolloomooloo as they were confident of State and SCC support. Londish’s $400 million “Gateway” development, with a FSR of 12.0, was lodged on 20 October 1971 (Ashton 1993, p.106). Liberal Premier Askin had personally supported the Gateway scheme and had arranged a line of credit with the Moscow Narodny Bank for Londish’s companies as reported in the Financial Review of 11 May 1972. A new street system prepared by the City Engineer to facilitate site consolidation was adopted by the SCC as the CRA believed it had a moral commitment, if not a legal one, to support the SPA plan as adopted by the Commissioners.\textsuperscript{36} However, Briger was persuaded that an Action Project was needed for the Woolloomooloo Precinct and through his influence the City Council resolved in March 1972 that such an Action Project would be prepared by Council’s own planning staff.

The story of Woolloomooloo is particularly interesting in terms of governance as local, state and national governments were all involved. The influence of political leaders as well as key individuals, such as Jack Munday the leader of the Builders Labourers’ Federation of New South Wales (BLF), was also important. The BLF imposed a “Black Ban” over Woolloomooloo and the media began to take an increasing interest in what was happening. The Federal Labor Opposition Party spokesman on urban affairs, Tom Uren, pledged that a Federal Labor Government would intervene to ensure a more appropriate form of development than that proposed under the SPA plan (Ashton 1993, p. 108).

\textsuperscript{35} As conveyed by Proudlove to the consultant team.

\textsuperscript{36} Information from a personal discussion between Briger and the researcher.
The history of BLF “Black Bans” (later known as “Green Bans”) is well documented in Green Bans and beyond (Munday, 1981), The Design of Sydney (James 1988, Chapter 6: Class War, Conflict and the Rebirth of Woolloomooloo) and Green Bans, Red Union (Bergmann, 1998). The Whitlam Federal Labor Government was elected in December 1972 and Tom Uren became Minister for Urban and Regional Development. The “Green Ban” and Uren’s appointment changed the dynamics and politics of the situation in Woolloomooloo.

As Chief Planning Officer the researcher had overall responsibility for the Council’s planning team preparing the Woolloomooloo Action Plan. Subsequently, as the Deputy City Planner, he was Chairman of the Woolloomooloo Steering Committee representing the three levels of government. The researcher therefore has detailed personal knowledge of the important events and the influence of key individuals in the planning history of Woolloomooloo which is included as Appendix 7.

In summary, work progressed on the Action Plan to the point where, it is contended, for the first time in the governance of Australia there was an agreement between the three levels of government. This was brought about through the influence of three individual politicians; Lord Mayor [Sir] Nicholas Shehadie, [Sir] John Fuller (Liberal State Minister of Planning), and Tom Uren (Federal Labor Minister for Urban and Regional Development). The new direction set for Woolloomooloo was mainly public housing in a low rise, individually identifiable, traffic-free, landscaped environment with modern amenities and services close to the CBD (James in Webber 1988, p. 116).

The Action Project progressed, monitored by the joint Woolloomooloo Steering Committee, and administrative agreement was reached by the three levels of government by the end of August 1974 on the future of Woolloomooloo. The State would compulsorily acquire the necessary land and the Commonwealth would provide $17 million to the NSW State Housing Commission. The details were worked out and on 27 June 1975 an historic governance Agreement was signed between Labor Prime Minister Whitlam, State Liberal Premier Tom Lewis and Lord Mayor Shehadie. This ensured Woolloomooloo would be re-established in its historic role as a residential area within the city (James in Webber 1988, p. 110). An Interim Development Order to vary the statutory City of Sydney Planning Scheme, 1971 was gazetted on 8 August 1975 which provided for predominantly residential uses in Woolloomooloo. It is asserted the Woolloomooloo Action Plan came to fruition and solved a substantial urban problem in Sydney through a strategic approach by the City Council which, with financial support from the Commonwealth, then changed the State’s statutory plan for the area.
In this Section it has been argued that the Council’s *City of Sydney Strategic Plan* (SCC, 1971) could not be implemented while the State, through its agencies the SPA and HOBAC, continued effective control of the city through the statutory plan. However, Woolloomooloo demonstrated what could be achieved through good governance arrangements and the influence of individuals. Clarke (and the researcher) therefore learned the lesson from Sydney in relation to planning in Adelaide that there needed to be an integration of strategic and statutory approaches.

1.4.16 SUMMARY

In this Chapter literature relevant to the exercise of the planning function between upper and lower levels of government has been examined in terms of intergovernmental relations in Britain, Canada, New Zealand, the USA and Australia. These countries have a common language and heritage but Lipset (1963, p.515) contends Britain is deferential and elitist; the USA is egalitarian and populist; while Canada and Australia (and New Zealand could be included) fall in between. It has been argued each nation has a central political focus with overriding powers which can be exercised through fiscal or statutory means. In the USA, Canada and Australia there are three levels of government while in Britain and New Zealand there are two levels. This makes a difference about the way in which power is exercised over the planning function of cities (local government) by the upper (national or state/provincial government) level.

The nature of planning in the 1970s in the Australian capital cities (except Adelaide) was reviewed. It was argued State governments exercised, to varying degrees and through different agencies, considerable power and governance over the respective capital city through the control of a statutory planning scheme. It was contended the City Councils of Sydney and Melbourne instigated a strategic planning approach but without integration with the statutory schemes of the respective State governments; strategic planning in the cities of Brisbane, Hobart and Perth did not eventuate until the 1980s. The different governance arrangements and planning models in Darwin and Canberra (see Appendix 6) were reviewed but it was considered they were not relevant compared to the other capital cities.

This analysis has provided a framework to evaluate the approach to planning and development control in Adelaide compared to the other capital cities of Australia. In Part Three of this thesis it will argued the relationship between the City the State resulted in an innovative and different approach.
PART TWO

The history of Adelaide and
South Australia from 1836 until 1972
CHAPTER 2.1

The background to the founding of Adelaide and South Australia in 1836; influence, heritage and governance

European settlement - Wakefield - Light - Hindmarsh - Light's City Plan - a “sense of difference”

2.1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter provides an outline and background to the founding of the Colony of South Australia and the siting of the City of Adelaide in 1836 within the Australian context. The choice of a site for the City marked the beginning of the influence of individuals over the City’s development and of the heritage of the City arising from Colonel William Light’s original plan, particularly the Park Lands. It was also the start of the tenuous power relationship between the City and the State for the governance of the City.

2.1.2 EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT IN AUSTRALIA

The judicial thinking in 18th century Britain was that harsh punishments were needed to deter potential criminals. The existence of a “criminal class” was one of the prime sociological beliefs (Hughes 1987, p.1). The Industrial Revolution had seen a dramatic rise in the population of cities and petty crime had become a major problem. Crimes against property attracted severe penalties and stealing was a serious offence. Hall (1998, p.658) comments summary offences included vagrancy, poaching, petty theft and drunkenness. Jails became overcrowded and the British Government started to use transportation of convicted criminals to the colonies as an alternative. When Britain lost its American colonies after the War of Independence, it was forced to look at other locations for its convicts. Lord Sydney, Home and Colonial Secretary in 1783, was faced with overcrowded criminal confinement and needed to solve the problem. During his voyage to the South Pacific in 1770 Captain James Cook had made landfall on a new land and claimed ‘Australia’ for Britain (Hughes 1987, p.62). The Transportation Act, 1784 authorised transportation to places other than America and in 1786 the Pitt Cabinet made a decision that Botany Bay would be such a place. Captain Arthur Philip was chosen to lead a colonisation expedition to the eastern coast of this recently discovered land and govern the new colony to be called New South Wales (Hughes 1987, p.67).
The First Fleet of eleven ships under Governor Arthur Philip, carrying 736 convicts, arrived in Botany Bay in the new colony on 26 January 1788. All the convicts had been convicted of quite minor crimes against property (Hughes 1987, p.72). New South Wales served as an official penal colony until 1823. Van Diemen’s Land was established as a penal colony in 1803 by an expedition from Sydney and became a colony in its own right in 1825. It was officially known as Tasmania from 1856. Another expedition from Sydney in 1823 founded the Moreton Bay penal settlement in what is now Queensland. Convicts were sent to Victoria, which was then known as the Port Philip District, between 1844 and 1849. Western Australia was proclaimed a British penal colony in 1849 and the first convicts arrived on Rottnest Island off the coast of Perth in 1850. The last convicts were sent from Britain to Australia in 1868 (Australian Department of Culture and Recreation, 2009).

South Australia was therefore the only colony not to have had a penal settlement and possesses a “convict free” background. Pike (1957) and Whitelock (1977) assert that free settlement in South Australia was an important aspect of the State’s “sense of difference”.

This Section has provided the framework for reviewing the settlement of South Australia. This will be examined in the next Section, particularly the influence of particular individuals on the settlement.

2.1.3 EDWARD GIBBON WAKEFIELD AND THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN LAND COMPANY

The foundation of the Colony of South Australia was primarily based on the systematic colonisation theory of Edward Gibbon Wakefield that land should be sold at a sufficient price to make the new colony self supporting (Wakefield, 1831, 1832). The new community was seen as a utopian settlement where land, capital and labour would be balanced (Hutchings, 2007). Dutton (1960, p.147) comments that the irony in South Australia’s history was that the germ of the high-minded principles of its foundation came from the brain of a convict in Newgate prison in London. Wakefield had been jailed for three years for abducting a schoolgirl heiress and spent his time in jail reading everything that he could on Australia (Dutton, 1960 p.147). After much lobbying by Wakefield and his supporters, the ‘Province of South Australia’ (Figure 6) was established by the South Australia Colonisation Act, 1834 of the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Cheesman (1986, p. 82) observes that the events leading to the settlement of the Province of South Australia have been well documented by Grenfell Price.

---

37 The Act was assented to on 15 August 1834 and enacted on 19 February 1836.
(1924), Pike (1957) and Eddy (1969). Whitelock (1977, p.23) also states that Wakefield realised that for his vision of free settlement to be successful, there needed to be opportunities for capitalist enterprise.

Figure 6 - South Australia in context
Source: Second Report of Colonisation in South Australia 1838, Barr Smith Library

The Bill for the Act was drafted by Wakefield and his brother (Crilly, 2008). It was introduced into the House of Commons by William Whitmore MP and it was supported in the House of Lords by the Duke of Wellington. The preamble to the South Australia Colonisation Act, 1834 (Figure 7) reads:

Act empowering His Majesty to erect South Australia into a Province. Anno Quarto and Quinto Gulicmi IV. Regis. Cap. XCV

"NOW KNOW YE that with the advice of Our Privy Council and in pursuance and exercise of the powers in us in that behalf vested by the said recited Act of Parliament WE do hereby erect and establish one Province to be called the Province of SOUTH AUSTRALIA—And we do hereby fix the Boundaries of the said Province in manner following (that is to say) On the North the twenty-sixth degree of South Latitude—On the South the Southern Ocean—On the West the one hundred and thirty-second degree of East Longitude—And on the East the one hundred and forty-first degree of East Longitude including therein all and every the Bays and Gulfs thereof together with the Island called Kangaroo Island and all and every the Islands adjacent to the said last mentioned Island or to that part of the main Land of the said Province PROVIDED ALWAYS that nothing in these our Letters Patent contained shall affect or be construed to affect the rights of any Aboriginal Natives of the said Province to the actual occupation or enjoyment in their own persons or in the persons of their descendants of any lands therein now actually occupied or enjoyed by such Natives IN WITNESS whereof We have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent WITNESS Curset at Westminster the Nineteenth day of February in the Sixth Year of our Reign.

"BY WRIT OF PRIVY SEAL
"EDMUNDS"

Figure 7 – Preamble to the Act
Source: State Records Office, Leigh Street, Adelaide
Dutton (1960, pp.148-9) states the Act provided for a Board of Commissioners to be appointed with responsibility for Land Sales and Emigration. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, Lord Glenelg, appointed Colonel Torrens, an Anglo-Irish MP, as the Chair with Angas, Barnard, Hill, Hutt, Lefevre, Mackinnon, Mills, Montefiore, Palmer and Wright as Commissioners. The Act also specified that £20,000 surety had to be created with £35,000 raised from the sale of land at a minimum of 12 shillings an acre before any settlement could occur. This was achieved, mainly through George Fife Angas who was the most prominent of the businessmen and bankers on the Board (Dutton, 1960 p.149). Angas retired from the Board and became the Chairman of the South Australian Company which had a subscribed capital of £200,000 and plans for whaling, wool and banking in the new colony.

Angas was one of a number of Christian non-conformists who, according to Hutchings (2007, p.2), were a curious mixture of radicalism and conservatism which set the very nature of South Australia and made it different from the other States, described by Bunker as a tradition of “conscious theoretical purpose” (Bunker in Hutchings, 2007). On one hand there was an advocacy of religious freedom and a willingness to experiment, while on the other there was a strong sense of the critical role of property and the need for respectability and propriety. Whitelock (1977) states that Angas had urged Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists and other Non-conformists and dissenters from the Church of England to immigrate to Adelaide – the “Paradise of Dissent”. Pike (1957) had originally used this phrase in the title of his book Paradise of Dissent: South Australia 1829 – 1857 in the context of a mid-19th century discussion.

It has been argued in this Section that particular individuals of influence determined the basis for the settlement of the ‘Province of South Australia’. In the next Section the influence of other individuals in the selection of the site for the capital of the new Province will be examined.

2.1.4 COLONEL WILLIAM LIGHT AND GOVERNOR JOHN HINDMARSH

The most important office in the new colony was that of the Governor. Sir Charles Napier had been appointed Governor-designate because of his interest in the systematic colonisation of South Australia. However, he resigned when his requests for troops to act as a police force and the ability

---

38 These names were perpetuated in the River Torrens and street names in the City of Adelaide on 23 May 1837 by a Street Naming Committee which included Governor Hindmarsh and Colonel Light. Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File ‘Street Naming Committee’.
to draw on the British Treasury should the Colony prove to be not self-supporting were refused by the government (Dutton, 1960; Cheesman, 1986; Bunker in Hutchings, 2007). Captain Sir John Hindmarsh RN learned of Napier’s resignation and, motivated by the salary and opportunity, lobbied for the post in London (Grenfell Price, 1924; Pike, 1957). Hindmarsh was appointed and became the first Governor resident in South Australia. He suggested Colonel William Light be appointed as the Surveyor-General for the new Colony. William Light was the son of Francis Light, the founder of Penang, and was born in Malacca in 1784 (Steuart, 1901). He was brought up by guardians in England and was well educated (Loyau 1883, p.156). Light and Hindmarsh had known each other in Egypt some years before. Light became friendly with Mohammed Ali (the Pasha who was the founder of modern Egypt) in 1830. By 1834 he was in command of the Nile which he sailed from England to become part of the Pasha’s navy. Light resigned from the Pasha’s service in November 1835 and Hindmarsh followed Light as the Captain of the Nile (Dutton 1960, p.144).

Light was both a sailor and a soldier and had a distinguished military career in the Peninsular War under the Duke of Wellington, who was later to support the Colonisation Act in the House of Lords. Dutton, (citing Napier’s History of the War in the Peninsula, Vol VI, p.7; Dutton 1960, p.72) describes Light’s exploits at Vic Bigorre on 19 March 1814 where he distinguished himself by feigning injury and riding close to the main lines of the French so that he was able to personally report their strength to Wellington. Stretton (H Stretton 2008, pers. comm., 2 July) also comments on Light’s background with Wellington in relation to the City of Adelaide and the theme of influence:

An important aspect of the history of South Australia and relations between the City and the State was the influence of individuals. This went back to the earliest days of the Colony. William Light had been on staff of the Duke of Wellington in the Peninsula War and acted as a scout. With great bravery he would ride close to the lines of the French enemy, obtain information about their strength and precise location and return to the English lines in safety where he would provide the Duke with an accurate map. Many years later when the Duke had become the Prime Minister and the Bill to establish the Colony of South Australia had been passed, he recalled his junior officer William Light who was now a Colonel, and recommended that he be the Surveyor-General because of his mapping abilities.

Thus Light became the Surveyor-General and the instructions for him from the Colonisation Commission established by the Act were that he was to examine 1500 miles [2414 kilometres] of coastline, select the best situation for the first settlement, survey the town site, and divide the country into sections. The specific directions of the Commissioners to Light are included in Appendix 8.

Light sailed from England on 1 May 1836 in the Rapid and arrived at Kangaroo Island on 20 August 1836. He was not impressed with the Island because it had no surface water and little arable land
and he quickly relocated to Rapid Bay on the mainland and started to explore the eastern coast of Gulf Saint Vincent (Figure 8). Settlers started arriving and camped at Holdfast Bay (now Glenelg) before Light had determined the site for the new city (Thomas 1925, 3rd edn, p.65; Crilly, 2008).

![Figure 8 - Kangaroo Island, Rapid Bay and Holdfast Bay](source-image)

Source: Arrowsmith’s 1839 map of South Australia with these three place names added

On 22 November 1836 Light wrote to the Commissioners enclosing a rough plan (Figure 9) with his opinions about the harbour and the plain. His indicative plan for the City showed two simple rectangles, one north and one south of the yet to be named River Torrens. Light commented that he proposed an area of land around the town to be reserved as “Park Grounds”. Light also wrote that although his duty obliged him to look at other sites, he was convinced that the eastern coast of Gulf Saint Vincent was the most eligible and that the fine little harbour would be safe (Dutton 1960, p.189; Whitelock 1977, p.27).

Governor Hindmarsh arrived at Holdfast Bay on the Buffalo and the new colony of South Australia was proclaimed by Hindmarsh on 28 December, 1836 (Dutton, 1960 p.196). Berg (2010) argues that Britain intended settlement in South Australia to be consensual requiring a treaty with the Aboriginals but this was ignored by Hindmarsh. Berg therefore asserts that the South Australian Aboriginals may have legal avenues for redress dating back to 1836. Light declined to attend the proclamation ceremony as he was evaluating the Adelaide plains (inhabited by the Kaurna people) for the site of
the City. Light was pleased with the supply of fresh water and the general appearance of the country between the hills and the sea. His decision for the site of the City was made on 29 December, 1836 (Loyau 1883, p.159; Gill 1910, p.54; Dutton 1960, p.197). On the following day Governor Hindmarsh accompanied Light to the site which Light had selected. Hindmarsh immediately criticised it as being too far from the harbour. But Light stuck to his decision, relying on his Instructions from the Commissioners that while he had to pay respect to the Governor's opinion, his own judgement was to be paramount in the selection of the site for the City.

Figure 9 - Light's original concept
Source: State Library of South Australia

Light moved from Holdfast Bay a few days later to start surveying the 1000 one acre [0.41 ha.] blocks as required by the Commissioners (Dutton, 1960 p.198). However, Hindmarsh ordered a public meeting on 10 February, 1837 to debate the issue of Light's preferred site of the City as Hindmarsh was still unhappy with Light's choice. At the meeting, a number of motions and amendments were put and Light recorded them in detail in his Brief Journal and Australian Diaries (Light, 1839). In summary, Light's site received 218 votes and Hindmarsh's proposed alternative site at the Harbour only received 137 votes – a clear majority of 81 (Dutton, 1960 p.212). Thus Light continued with his survey and completed it on 10 March, 1837.
In this Section it has been argued that the choice of a site for Adelaide marked the beginning of the differences, through individuals of influence, between the City and the State. Light’s plan for the City on the selected site will be examined and analysed in the next Section.

2.1.5 LIGHT’S PLAN FOR THE CITY OF ADELAIDE

There is much controversy about the origins of Light’s plan for the City of Adelaide with its belt of continuous Park Lands and six public Squares (Figure 10). The plan incorporated about 2,300 acres [931 ha.] of Park Lands enclosing and dividing 1042 Town Acres [421 ha.] (Cheesman 1986, p.109).

Dutton (1960, p.214) considers Light may have seen T. J. Maslen’s The Friends of Australia (1830) but Dutton (ibid, p.215) favoured a theory that Light was influenced by the traditional plans of Roman camps. Cheesman (1986) asserts that Maslen was the nom de plume of Allen Gardiner and cited Gardiner (1830, Chapter xiii):

All entrances to every town should be through a park, that is to say a belt of park of about a mile or two [1.6 to 3.2 km] in diameter, should entirely surround every town, save and excepting such sides as are washed by a river or lake.
Johnson & Langmead (1986) argue that there is no actual evidence that Light was responsible for the selection of the site and suggested it was really the work of George Kingston, Light’s deputy. They base this view on letters Kingston wrote in 1877, some thirty years after the event, wherein he claimed to have informed Light that he had identified an appropriate site and recommended it to Light. Johnson & Langmead (1986 p.36) assert that Grenfell Price (1924), Dutton (1960) and Elder (1984) all made erroneous interpretations about Light and the credit for siting Adelaide should have gone to Kingston. Whatever role Kingston may actually have played, the ultimate responsibility for the choice of the site for the City of Adelaide was that of the Surveyor–General, Colonel William Light. Indeed, Kingston wrote a letter to The Advertiser (12 November 1877):

I deny the right of the Government to interfere with or make use of any portion of the Park Lands not specifically reserved or set apart for Government purposes by Colonel Light and so described on his original plan for the City. I think I may be excused for claiming to speak as an authority on this subject, because my official position next to Colonel Light on the survey staff gave me the best opportunity of knowing every detail of his plans, as well as it being my duty to see that his instructions were properly carried out.

Mary Thomas, one of the original settlers, wrote in her diary in 1837 that it was Colonel Light who had chosen and laid out the site for Adelaide (Thomas 1925, 3rd edn, p.80). Cheesman (1986, p.103) asserts that Light was familiar with the spatial consequences of colonial new towns and the need for concentration and enclosure as a means of controlling the supply and value of land. Cheesman (1986, p.104) further observes that Gother Mann’s plan for Toronto was eminently suitable for the new city in South Australia. Gill (1910, p.113) draws attention to part of the Letter of Instructions from the Commissioners to Light which stated “Look to any new town precedent in America and Canada”, 39

Light would have been aware of the layout of London squares before he left for South Australia (Whitfield, 2006). Rasmussen observes that the London square model was recognised as a suitable location for a town residence and a place where people of the same class had their houses. The squares form fine geometrical figures in the town plan and were London’s contribution to city design in the 18th century. At the beginning of the 19th century new parts of London were laid out on the same lines with houses integrated into the squares to create a distinct urban character (Rasmussen 1961, pp.157–168).

Johnson & Langmead (1986, p.9) argue that the Greeks and Romans used the grid to simplify the laying out of new colonies. Cataneo’s ideal plan for a new city in 1554 featuring a central square and

39 See Appendix 8.
surrounding smaller squares (Figure 11) was suggested as a possible precedent for the British colonies in North America with the layouts of Charleston 1672, Philadelphia 1683, and Savannah 1733 (Johnson & Langmead 1986, p.14).

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 100 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 11 - Cataneo's Plan for the ideal city with a central square and surrounding smaller squares
Source: Rosenau in Cheesman 1986, p.51

Hutchings (2007, p.2) suggests that Light's plan also alluded to the Baroque influences of later Renaissance Europe and the theories of new town design evolved for the settlement of the Americas by the English, French and Spanish speaking peoples.

Conybeare, who studied in Philadelphia, believes from discussions he had there as a student that Light may have lived in Philadelphia and would have been familiar with William Penn’s 1683 plan (Conybeare, Darrel, ohi 16 / 91:93, Sydney, 24 October 2007). There is some similarity in Light's layout of South Adelaide with Penn's plan (Figure 12) in terms of the rectangular grid, five squares, the containment of the city (although in Philadelphia’s case with rivers on two sides), the width of streets and the overall scale. Light's Town Acres compare with Penn's one acre or half-acre lots.

Llewelyn-Davies (2000, p.65) argues that square blocks, as planned by Light and Penn, provide the most flexible basis for accommodating a range of commercial and residential buildings and provide more options for internal division and treatment.
Johnson & Langmead (1986, p.16) observe that Penn had much in common with the founders of Adelaide namely, liberal political attitudes, a belief in religious freedom, a desire to establish a new paternalistic landed gentry and an agrarian rather than an industrial society.

The original requirement was for 1000 Town Acres – each a one acre (0.41 ha.) lot. Light actually provided 700 Town Acres in the almost rectangular South Adelaide, and a total of 342 Town Acres in the three components making up North Adelaide. Cheesman (1986, p.109) argues that 38 Town Acres had been used to create the six squares, and four had been reserved for Government buildings so that 42 were added to the 1000 available for sale. 437 Town Acres had been sold in London at a cost of 12 shillings an acre in accordance with the Act and on 23 March, 1837 the remaining lots began to be sold by auction. They were all sold by 28 March, 1837 (Bunker in Hutchings 2007, p.13). The South Australian Company bought a number of Town Acres while Governor Hindmarsh personally bought 19 Town Acres and Colonel Light bought 13 Town Acres.40

Whatever may have been Light's inspiration, his genius was to mould his original concept of two rectangles to the topography (Figure 13) so that North Adelaide, and East Terrace in South Adelaide, in particular, follow the contours as depicted. Bowen considers that Light also paid respect to views and vistas, and planned his streets to provide a north-south orientation for buildings with protection from the extremes of climate, particularly the sun (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 10:12, College Park, 16 April 2007).

40 The original purchasers of the 1042 numbered Town Acres are shown on a map owned by The Adelaide Club.
The task of putting Light's hand drawn draft plan to paper was given to Robert Thomas, a sixteen year old draughtsman, who used watercolour and ink. He was the eldest son of Robert and Mary Thomas who were amongst the original settlers and established the first newspaper in the colony, *The Register*, on 3 June 1837 (Thomas 1925, 3rd edn, p.vii). The Thomas map eventually came into the possession of the History Trust of South Australia who engaged Artlab Australia to conserve and restore the plan and it is now held in the Migration Museum.\(^{41}\) It should be noted that the only buildings which Light indicated in the Park Lands on his plan were the Government House and a (Military) Barracks off North Terrace, a Hospital off East Terrace, a Market off West Terrace, and a (Military) Store and (Aboriginal Mission) School off Strangways Terrace in North Adelaide. A location for a cemetery was also shown off West Terrace. Light showed great foresight in providing for the burial of the early colonists as only the colonial government had the resources to manage a cemetery. The West Terrace Cemetery is the only part of the Park Lands which has never been under the care and control of the Adelaide City Council and has remained a State Government responsibility (Nicol 1997, p.9).

\(^{41}\) Information provided by Artlab Australia, 70 Kintore Avenue, Adelaide.
Freeland (1968, p.63) comments that many attempts have been made to trace the sources of Light’s inspiration for the plan for Adelaide but no direct connection has been made between any town that Light may have visited or served in. Freestone (2010, p.49) asserts Light’s imaginative plan incorporated a range of influences making it one of the most sophisticated town templates in the world. Dutton (1960, p.214) argues there is little profit in speculating on the origins of Light’s plan as Light suffered a terrible blow on Tuesday, 22 January 1839 when his mud and reed hut burnt down and most of his possessions were lost. Light wrote in his diary (Light 1839, p.144):

At 2pm while finishing our dinner a rumbling noise was heard and looking out we discovered Fisher’s house to be on fire. At the same time, the breeze freshening up, the destruction to both houses became inevitable. In less than ten minutes both houses were burnt to the ground, mine catching fire at the roof by a lighted piece from Fisher’s. We saved nothing of value. Of clothes I only saved what I had on.  

Light’s plan for the City of Adelaide is highly regarded. Freeland considers it was an inspiration to split the town and leave the river valley as Park Lands and this lifted the conception “from being merely good to excellent” (Freeland 1972, p.10 cited in Freestone 2010, p.92). Adelaide is considered as one of the best urban plans in the world and is on Australia’s National Heritage List (Government of South Australia Department of Planning & Local Government 2009, p.2). Mann (1986, p.194) argues it is a tribute to Light the plan of Adelaide survives almost intact and continues to determine the character of the City. Peter Garrett\(^{43}\) comments he had the privilege of adding the “Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout” to the National Heritage List as one of Australia’s greatest examples of planning heritage (Freestone 2010, Foreword, p. vii).

In this Section Light’s plan for the City of Adelaide has been examined and analysed including possible influences on his design. The heritage of the City arising from the plan, particularly the Park Lands, marks the beginning of the individual influence of Light over the City’s development. Light’s later work is reviewed in the next Section.

2.1.6 LIGHT’S WORK AFTER HIS PLAN FOR THE CITY OF ADELAIDE

The ill-feeling between Light and Hindmarsh continued after the site for the City had been resolved. This time it was over the survey of the Country Sections which Light was required to undertake as part of his position as Surveyor-General. Hindmarsh, as Governor of the whole Colony, was

---

\(^{42}\) Some of Light’s diaries and paintings did survive and are in the Adelaide Town Hall, the State Library and the Art Gallery of South Australia.

\(^{43}\) Commonwealth Minister for Environment, Heritage and the Arts.
concerned that other land should be surveyed in the country so that it could be sold and settled. In London the Colonisation Commissioners had promised choice land to potential purchasers and thus Hindmarsh urged Light to proceed with the task of surveying the Country Sections (Dutton, 1960 p.243). While Light had been able to survey the City of Adelaide on foot he could not hope to survey the Country Sections outside the City without proper transport; thus bullocks were brought from Van Dieman’s Land (Whitelock 1977, p.34). Initially, Light surveyed 515 Country Sections some of which accommodated 134 acres [54.42 ha.] and the smaller ones 80 acres [32.37 ha.] (Bunker in Hutchings, 2007 p.16). To the northeast from the City the Sections are aligned to the path of the River Torrens. To the northwest they radiate from “the proposed road and canal to the Harbour” as annotated on the map. Otherwise the Sections follow a north-south and east-west grid as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 - Light’s layout of the Country Sections outside the City
Source: Appendix to Report from Select Committee on South Australia No. 2, 1839

44 The original 1839 Arrowsmith map is entitled “The District of Adelaide, South Australia as divided into Country Sections from the trigonometrical survey of Colonel Light”.
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By December 1837 Light and his staff had surveyed a total of 9,838 acres [4,097 ha.]. The future of the colony depended on primary production which in turn depended on the availability and sale of properly surveyed land for settlement (Whitelock 1977, p.34). A total of 437 preliminary land-orders had been sold in London which entitled the holders to purchase one Town Acre [0.41 ha.] and 80 acres [32.37 ha.] in the Country Sections (Crilly 1999). After a petition to the Governor from 116 of the holders of preliminary land-orders then in Adelaide, Hindmarsh finally agreed that a ballot could be held on 17 March 1837 (Prest, Round & Fort 2001, p.547). Dutton states that by a remarkable chance, Light’s name was drawn first (Dutton 1960, p.244). Light chose Country Section 1 which was land west of the Park Lands with a frontage to the River Torrens which today is in Thebarton (Light 1839, p.41).

Light had sent his deputy, Kingston, back to London on the Rapid to seek more staff and resources to carry out the survey of the Country Sections. By June 1838 when Kingston returned a total of 24,595 acres [10,249 ha.] had already been surveyed. Whitelock asserts Kingston played Light false and instead of the additional resources requested, Kingston brought with him demands from the Commissioners that Light abandon his trigonometrical survey in favour of an allegedly quicker “running survey” (Whitelock 1977, p.34). Light and most of his surveying staff resigned immediately. He then formed the firm of Light, Finniss and Co., and the areas of Glenelg, Port Adelaide and Gawler were subsequently surveyed by the firm. Elder (in Light 1839, revised edition 1984, p.43) observes that Robert Thomas, the young draughtsman who had been responsible for putting Light’s plan down on paper, was a member of the firm.

In June 1838 Hindmarsh received orders from the Colonial Commissioners and he was recalled as Governor. Hindmarsh departed South Australia on 14 July 1838 and thus Light outstayed his old foe in the colony (Whitelock 1977, p.39). Light’s health declined and he retired to the cottage he had built for himself in Country Section No.1 and called Theberton after Theberton in Suffolk where his family had lived (Dutton 1960, p.279; Whitelock 1977, p.35). Light began preparing his Brief Journal, (Light 1839) based on his diaries, for publication. He commented in the Preface that his motivation was to justify the correctness of his decision on the choice for the site of the City of Adelaide because of “the various attacks so insidiously made upon nearly every step I thought fit to take”. The Preface was dated 29 March and it was printed and published by Archibald MacDougall of Rundle Street, Adelaide.

---

45 As referred to in Figure 11.
on 26 June 1839. Due to a transcription error “Theberton” became “Thebarton” in Light’s printed Brief Journal and it has remained so ever since. Light became weak and he died of consumption on 6 October 1839 (Dutton 1960, p.287). A copper plate with an inscription describing Light as the founder of the City of Adelaide was placed inside his coffin (Loyau 1883, p.159). The funeral procession went from Light’s cottage in Thebarton to Trinity Church on North Terrace for the service and then to Light Square where he was buried on 10 October 1839. Dutton (1960, p.288) and Whitelock (1977, p.36), quoting from the Register of 12 October 1839, described the funeral as follows:

The procession left Thebarton Cottage a little before twelve and until its arrival at Trinity Church Minute Guns were fired. All business ceased and the flag at Government House flew at half mast. Four hundred and fifty gentlemen mourned at his graveside.

Colonel George Gawler had been appointed as the Governor to succeed Hindmarsh and he arrived in South Australia on 12 October 1838. He pointedly ignored Light for many months and when he finally invited Light for dinner at Government House, Light declined (Dutton 1960, p.279). However, when Light died, Gawler immediately sanctioned the expenditure of £100 for a memorial (Whitelock 1977, p.36). Dutton (1960, p.289) comments it was an irony that the memorial to Light above his gravesite was designed by his former deputy, Kingston, with whom he had fallen out. The sandstone memorial bore the following inscription (Loyau 1883, p.159):

Erected by
The Pioneers of South Australia
in memory of
COLONEL WILLIAM LIGHT
First Surveyor-General
and by whom
the site of Adelaide was fixed
on 29th December, 1836.
Died 5th October, 1839,
Aged 54 years.

However, the monument crumbled away within a few years and a new memorial, in the form of a theodolite, was erected in 1905 and it remains in Light Square today. Light is also remembered as the founder of the City in an annual ceremony by the Adelaide City Council and with a statue.

---

46The original work was in a pamphlet-like book and in 1911 it was reprinted as a supplement to the Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Australasia (SA Branch). A photographic facsimile was published by the State Library of South Australia in 1963 and in 1984 it reappeared as the first publication of the Wakefield Press with an Introduction and Notes by David Elder.


48 For details about the Council ceremony and statue see Appendix 9.
Sir Samuel Way, the Lieutenant-Governor of South Australia, stated in June 1905 (Crilly, 2008):

Where in the wide world will you find a city better planned than Adelaide? Adelaide with its broad streets and its squares and its Park Lands - 2,300 acres in extent – a grand inheritance of the citizens for all time. The choice and laying out of the site of the City of Adelaide was an effort of genius.

Stretton (1970, p.1) observes:

We live in a famously planned town. William Light designed it in one hot Christmas week of 1836; generations later his planning is still blessed, and used as he intended. From a city neighbourhood we step into his versatile Park Lands to play various sports and games, swim, fish, graze horses or bet on them racing, and enjoy the botanical gardens or the local pastime of confusing the university with the zoo. Ten minutes away, Boeings take off to connect it to the rest of the world.

Cheesman (1986, p.110) asserts:

The procedure and planning which led to the founding of Adelaide was unique in its time.

Robin Boyd (Serle 1995, p.119) states:

Colonel Light’s plan made Adelaide the first city in Australia, if not the world, to provide for the health and recreation of all its citizens.

Freestone (2010, p.275) contends:

Adelaide is the most memorable expression of the ‘grand model’ of the Colonial planning tradition, distinguished by encircling Park Lands and internal public squares.

However, Light’s own often quoted words (Light 1839, Preface) encapsulate his enduring epitaph:

The reasons that led me to fix Adelaide where it is I do not expect to be generally understood or calmly judged of at the present. My enemies, however, by disputing their validity in every particular, have done me the good service of fixing the whole of the responsibility upon me. I am perfectly willing to bear it; and I leave it to posterity, and not to them, to decide whether I am entitled to praise or blame.

Light’s work after his city plan for Adelaide has been reviewed in this Section and the views of many scholars about the influence of Light and the importance of the Park Lands have been expressed.
2.1.7 SUMMARY

In this Chapter three themes, influence, heritage and governance, of the four themes of this thesis have been established. It was asserted Colonel Light, the Surveyor-General, and Captain Hindmarsh, the Governor, had very different views as to where the City of Adelaide should be located. It has been argued that the choice of a site for the City marked the beginning of the influence of individuals over the City's development. It was also argued the heritage of the City arose from Light's original plan when he encircled the Town Acres required for settlement with Park Lands. The start of the exercise of the power relationship between the City and the State regarding the ongoing governance of the City, particularly in terms of any alienation of the Park Lands, has been examined.
CHAPTER 2.2

The development of the City and State from 1840 until 1950 and the City/State relationship during this period; influence, heritage and governance

Town Clerk Worsnop - Innovations - Alienation of areas of the Park Lands - The Adelaide Club - Town Planning - Howard and the Garden City Movement - Reade - Premier Playford - Town Clerk Veale

2.2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter charts the history of the City and the State from 1840 until 1900 and then from the beginning of the 20th century until 1950. The development and governance of the City in terms of the relationship between the City Council and the State is examined, particularly the alienation of Park Lands by the State. The influence of individuals involved in the City/State relationship through common memberships of the Adelaide City Council, The Adelaide Club and the State’s Legislative Council is analysed. Town Planning and the emerging Garden City Movement are reviewed in relation to the continued dominance of the City within the Adelaide metropolitan area.

2.2.2 THE GROWTH OF THE CITY FROM 1840 UNTIL 1900

The South Australia Colonisation Act, 1834 provided for the operation of local government in the colony and the Municipal Corporation Act, 1840 was passed by Governor Gawler, making Adelaide the second oldest City, after Toronto, in the Commonwealth outside the United Kingdom.

The first elections for the City Council were held in October 1840 and James Fisher was elected as Mayor. The economy became depressed and the Council failed financially after little more than a year. The affairs of the City were transferred to a City Commission consisting of five persons nominated by the Governor. The Commission had the power to levy rates and was responsible for maintaining the streets and bridges as well as constructing sewers and establishing waterworks (Worsnop 1878, p. 91).

Thomas Worsnop was in a position of influence as the Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide from 1869 until 1898. He died in office at the age of 79. Worsnop (1878) wrote a detailed account of the history
of the City from 1836 until 1877. However, Morton (1996) critiqued Worsnop’s work as dull and leaving much to be desired.

Light’s original plan had identified some uses to be located in the Park Lands as described in the previous Chapter. Schedule J to the Municipal Corporation Act for the City of Adelaide, 1849 clarified that the Park Lands were under the care, control and management of the Adelaide City Council except for Government Reserves which included West Terrace Cemetery (Daly 1980, p.32).

By the 1830s there were substantial railway lines in Britain and one criticism of Light’s Plan for the City was that he made no provision for the inevitable impact of a railway. However, Thomas had noted that Light considered a railway to the port would be required (Thomas 1925 3rd edn, p.89). The Adelaide City and Port Railway Act, 1850 allocated land for a railway to be built to Port Adelaide which would go through the Park Lands to the west of the City from a terminus on North Terrace. Construction started in 1852 and the railway was the first major alienation of the Park Lands (Daly 1980, p.132).

On 1 June 1852 the Council was re-established by the Governor with four Aldermen and 12 Councillors and Fisher was again elected as the Mayor (Worsnop 1878, p.101). The British Government encouraged the development of representative government in the Australian Colonies though the Australian Colonies Government Act, 1850. South Australia had a Legislative Council consisting of four officials, four non-officials appointed by the Governor and 16 members elected by the people. The Legislative Council drafted its own Constitution which provided for a Parliament and this was adopted in 1856. This completely altered the Governor’s position of influence as he could no longer act on his own authority but only on the advice of Ministers who were responsible to Parliament. Only males over 21 years of age who owned property were entitled to vote in the elections for a representative South Australian Colonial Government. These elections were first held in March 1857, some 17 years after a representative Adelaide City Council had been elected (Parliament of South Australia, 2008).

The business functions of the agricultural sector and later the manufacturing sector, located in the City. Because of Light’s foresight and the influence he had in siting the City it remained as the geographic centre of the metropolitan area. It also became the hub of the transportation system and was supreme as the political, administrative, legal, academic and ecclesiastical centre of South Australia (Roche & Llewellyn-Smith 1976, p.98; Morton 1996, p.xii).
In 1858 the Colonial Parliament enacted the *Real Property (Torrens Title) Act, 1858* which created a simplified, cheap and efficient system of land title registration. The Act was formulated by the then Premier, Sir Robert Torrens, and introduced a land register where the registered proprietor of land has an indefeasible title to it. This was a unique innovation in South Australia which was later copied in the other States and overseas (Whitelock 1977, p.102).

The State continued to alienate areas of Park Lands and excised them from the care, control and management of the Council. In 1861 four acres [1.62 ha] of the western Park Lands were allocated for an Observatory. Two years later a further 20 acres [8.09 ha] in the north-western Park Lands were set aside for the Adelaide Jail (Daly 1980, p.128).

The *Adelaide University Act, 1874* was passed to establish the University of Adelaide so that a gift of £20,000 from Walter Hughes to endow two professorships could be put into effect. Hughes had become wealthy from the copper discovered on his property in Wallaroo on Yorke Peninsula (Whitelock 1977, p102). For the first time five acres [2.02 ha] of prime Government Reserve in the Park Lands were allocated for an institutional use (Worsnop 1878, p.371). This was not without some opposition and in the debate of the Second Reading of the Bill in the House of Assembly the Hon. J Fisher regretted the use of the Park Lands for an exclusive purpose as, in his view, they had been created for the glory of the colony and were now being alienated (*Parliamentary Debates*, South Australian House of Assembly, 29 October 1874).

The *Parliament Buildings Act, 1877* authorised Park Lands on the northern side of North Terrace to be used for the Houses of Parliament. The *National Gallery of South Australia Act, 1881* alienated more Park Lands so that an Art Gallery could also be built on the northern side of North Terrace. The Adelaide City Council was supportive of the University, Parliament and Art Gallery and did not oppose the loss of Park Lands for these purposes (Worsnop 1878, p.401). At this time in 1881 Mayor [Sir] Edwin Smith was responsible for damming the River Torrens to create the Torrens Lake which was not envisaged in Light’s Plan. Smith was one of many members of the City Council who also had successful careers in Parliament (Whitelock 1977, p.112).

Whitelock (1977, p.111) asserts that by the 1870s the City was suffering from an unpleasant atmosphere arising from defective drainage, foul-smelling water tables and an enormous accumulation of night soil. In 1878 work began on a sophisticated underground waterborne sewerage system. By 1881 the installation of sewer mains and a sewerage farm at Islington meant Adelaide
was the first Australian city to have a complete and modern sewer system and this was another South Australian innovation (Shannahan, Jones & Hughes 2010, p.170). However, there was a small loss of some Park Lands to provide for the valve house of the system. Daly (1980, p.56) observes that over the years small pieces of the Park Lands, particularly those in Government reserves, have been alienated for various purposes simply by means of a proclamation in the Government Gazette.

The South Australian Parliament enfranchised women in 1894. This was another innovation and a constitutional first in Australia. Whitelock (1977, p.218) asserts this was the result of the formation in 1888 of the Women’s Suffrage League which had notable power base in Adelaide, particularly through the Methodist Church.

This Section has examined the growth of the City from 1840. Innovations in South Australia have been identified as well as the alienation of areas of Park Lands by the State in terms of the governance of the City. In the next Section it will be argued that the members of The Adelaide Club had considerable influence in the development of the City and the State.

2.2.3 THE ADELAIDE CLUB AND ITS INFLUENCE

The population continued to grow during the remainder of the 19th century and expand beyond the Park Lands while the City retained its commercial and political dominance in the State. Morton (1996, p.xii) contends that in many respects the history of Adelaide is the history of South Australia. The City was totally dominant over the State and had the nature of a city/state. Its governance was influenced by a small group of people who controlled the money and made all the important decisions (Sandercock, 1975a; Linn, 2006). Toynbee (1979) and Badcock (2002) have analysed the distinctive qualities of city/states and further information about city/states is provided in Appendix 10.

Whitelock (1977 p. 213) asserts that the City was where the pinnacle of individual influence existed. Old Adelaide families with names such as the Barr Smiths’, Bonythons’, Elders’, Morphetts’, Seppelts’ and Rymills’ appeared in Parliament and the City Council with common membership of The Adelaide Club (Morgan, 1971). The Adelaide Club was established in 1868 by businessmen and pastoralists who had profited from the early years of rapid growth (Fischer & Seamark, 2005). The Club was built on North Terrace in 1863 (Figure 15) as the home of the Adelaide male establishment. Members of the Club exercised influence through their membership of the City Council and through the property-
based franchise of the Legislative Council. Indeed, Fischer & Seamark (2005) assert that more decisions affecting the development of South Australia were made in The Adelaide Club than in Parliament.

**Figure 15** – The Adelaide Club when constructed on North Terrace in 1863
Source: Secretary, The Adelaide Club, 2008

Stretton (1975, p.133) observes the Adelaide oligarchy tended to marry each other’s money, meet at The Adelaide Club and ‘preserve standards’ in quaint Victorian ways, but they were honest and often puritanical. They were used to cosy but lawful relations between business and government.

McPhail considers the ties between The Adelaide Club, the Adelaide City Council and the Legislative Council through property ownership were remarkable. The City represented a powerful pastoral-based economy which enabled a particular pattern of power and authority to evolve. Thus it was not a surprise that the City Council exerted considerable influence in Colonial and State affairs. McPhail further recalls there was an old joke that the Adelaide City Council and the Legislative Council did not operate in a party political sense because they were just one party (McPhail, Ian, ohi 34 / 57:61, Melbourne, 18 April, 2008).

Dunstan asserts the Adelaide City Council resented any interference by the State Government and could gather to itself a majority of reactionaries in the Legislative Council to resist any initiative by the Government. In fact some of these reactionaries had been formerly members of the Adelaide City Council and overwhelmingly represented the Adelaide establishment (Dunstan 1981, p.184).

In this Section the influence of The Adelaide Club has been examined. This influence continued until 1984 when an amendment to the *Local Government Act* changed the property franchise to ‘one vote
one value’ and the power of the Adelaide City Council in relation to the State Government began to wane. The development and governance of the City within the context of town planning and the garden city movement will be addressed in the next Section.

2.2.4 TOWN PLANNING AND THE GARDEN CITY MOVEMENT


Writers and philosophers condemned the life of industrial cities, but more practically minded men and women sought to improve them by sanitary reform and by creating model industrial villages (Sandercock 1975a, p.12). Hall (1998, p.658) asserts that by the 1830s industrialisation had created immense changes in the cities of Britain. They were being overwhelmed by crime, destitution and overcrowding. Disease, particularly cholera, resulted from foul sewerage and bad water.

A House of Commons Select Committee Report in 1840, The Health of Towns, had some radical findings. Firstly, unhealthy conditions created an economic loss and reduced labour productivity. Secondly, towns fostered unrest and defiance of the law which threatened social order. However, Sandercock (1975a, p.12) notes that property was a dominant theme and a major consideration of all reformers. Indeed, Eversley (1973, p.15) questions whether the later emergence of town planning was simply an instrument of property protection.

The Public Health Act, 1875 in Britain gave local authorities the power to control the standard of new dwellings and the Housing of the Working Classes Act, 1890 gave local authorities the power to deal with the closure and removal of unhealthy dwellings and the power to build new dwellings for the
working classes from public funds (Bennett 1976, p.13). The issues of health, housing and planning were linked in the *Housing and Town Planning Act, 1909* in Britain where the words “town planning” were used for the first time (Sandercock 1975a, p.14).

John Burns MP (House of Commons *Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. 188, May 1908) in speaking to the Bill in the House of Commons said:

> The Bill aims in broad outline at, and hopes to secure, the home healthy, the house beautiful, the town pleasant, the city dignified and the suburbs salubrious.

Eversley (1973, p.55) asserts that there was a strong belief amongst the technical professions of architecture and engineering that legislation could provide a better life for communities as social improvement depended on environmental improvement. Low density housing became the overriding principle of planning and the ideas of community and of social integration were assumed to be achievable by physical means (Sandercock 1975a, p.15).

As well as the campaigns for better public health standards with technical improvements because of the emergence of professional surveyors and engineers, there was a landscape movement with painters such as Wilson and Constable leading a change from the formal to the picturesque with parks, trees and open spaces and the idea of a garden suburb. Some enlightened factory owners provided better living conditions through private enterprise as a means of practical sociology. These included Titus Salt’s Saltaire in 1852, George Cadbury’s Bourneville in 1879, the Lever Brothers’ Port Sunlight in 1888 and Joseph Rowntree’s New Eastwick in 1904 (Brown & Sherrard 1959, p.275). As early as 1799 Robert Owen had improved the physical environment for the workers at the mills he owned in New Lanark, Scotland, which had resulted in improved productivity and profits. In 1817 he put forward a plan to construct cooperative communities and while it came to nothing, Brown & Sherrard (1959, p.274) asserted that its significance lay in its insistence on a planned community with regard to social and economic aspects as well as its physical shape.

The Royal Institute of British Architects held a Town Planning conference in London in 1910 attended by the leaders in the emerging profession of town planning. These included Burnham and Robinson from America, Henard from France, Stubben from Germany, and Howard and Geddes from Britain (Freestone 2007, p.19). Tregenza (2007, p.45) argues that the development of town planning in Britain and America was fostered by particular people, notably Howard in Britain and Robinson in America.
Hall (in Freestone 2000, p.21) contends that Geddes, Howard and Kropotkin were active in founding The Royal Town Planning Institute in London in 1914. Geddes (1915) argued that town planners needed to realise the importance of both people and the environment; a synthesis of all factors relating to a case; and synergy, the combined cooperative action of everyone involved.

The American City Planning Institute was incorporated in 1917 and can trace its roots back to 1909 when the first National Conference on City Planning was held in Washington, DC and an organised planning movement emerged from subsequent conferences (American Planning Association, 2009). Freestone (2008, p.72) uses the terms ‘city beautiful’, ‘city functional’ and ‘city social’ in relation to the new science of town planning aimed at improving urban health, efficiency and beauty. The ‘city beautiful’ movement assumed that an attractive city would become an economically vital, socially harmonious city and ugliness itself was seen as the root of most urban ills (Banovetz 1971 p.305).

Ebenezer Howard published “Tomorrow: a peaceful path to real reform” in 1898 and it was republished in its better known version of “Garden Cities of Tomorrow” in 1902. A new edition with a preface by F. J. Osborn was published in 1945 (Freestone 1989, p.2). Howard (1945, p.29) argues that what was needed was a marriage of town and country; rustic health and sanity was to be balanced with urban activity and knowledge to provide a foundation for effective community life. Freestone (2010, p.14) further observes that Howard’s ‘garden city movement’ promoted house-and-garden living while the ‘city beautiful’ ideas were associated with grand civic art and aesthetic reforms.

Osborn (in Howard, 1945, Preface) describes the essence of Howard’s thinking as:

- moderately sized industrial and trading towns in close contact with surrounding agricultural countryside;
- each one a healthy, well-equipped and coherent community;
- zoning of areas within each town for ready access between homes, workplaces, shops and cultural centres;
- gardens and recreation spaces;
- limitations of density to safeguard light;
- civic design aiming at harmony rather than standardisation;
- planned internal and external communications; and,
- unified site ownership coupled with leaseholds, reconciling public interest with freedom of choice.

Howard (1945, p.29) refers to Wakefield’s proposals for South Australia for an organised migratory movement as a systematic plan of colonization which could be used as a model for populating a new
Garden City. Cheesman (1986, p.152) asserts that Howard was markedly influenced by Light’s plan of Adelaide.

Howard (1898) asks his readers to:

Consider for a moment the case of a city in Australia which in some measure illustrates the principle for which I am contending. The City of Adelaide is surrounded by Park Lands. The city is built up. How does it grow? It grows by leaping over the Park Lands and establishing North Adelaide. And this is the principle which it is intended to follow, but improve upon in the Garden City.

The ‘picture’ portrays the Park Lands as constraining the growth of the central area with a new suburb of North Adelaide emerging to the north of the Park Lands. But Howard had failed to understand that both North and South Adelaide were part of Light’s original plan for the City and that North Adelaide did not develop later as a separate entity after “leaping over the Park Lands”.

Keeble (1969, p.106) expresses the view that Howard saw the town-country magnet as drawing people towards it because a town of limited size would combine all the advantages of both the town and the country while having the disadvantages of neither. Freestone (1989, p.2) describes the ‘Garden City’ as a distinctive approach to urban and regional planning that was later to help shape the residential environment of many Australians. He states that Howard’s illustration of a magnet (Figure 16) has been described as the most famous town planning diagram in the world (Freestone 1989, p.2).

![Figure 16 - The three magnets of Howard](Image)

Source: “Tomorrow: a peaceful path to real reform” (Howard, 1898)
This Section has provided a background and framework for examining the emergence of town planning in Australia. Town planning and the garden city movement in South Australia and the influence of Charles Reade will be reviewed in the next Section.

2.2.5 THE INFLUENCE OF CHARLES READE IN ADELAIDE

Tregenza (2007, p.47) argues that much is owed to Charles Reade because he was influential in promoting town planning in South Australia. Freestone (1989, p.76) considers Reade the single most important figure in Australian garden city history because he was an active proponent and advocate of its ideals but he was not involved in the original theory and diagrams. Indeed, Cheesman (1986, p.173) asserts that Reade’s ideas were essentially spatial and administrative concepts gleaned from others, but they were influential.

Reade was born in New Zealand in 1880 and spent his formative years in Sydney and Hobart. In 1906 when in London he drafted a series of articles for Australian newspapers. These were published later as *The Revelation of Britain: a Book for Colonials* which outlined his ideas for town planning reform (Tregenza 2007, p.45; Cheesman 1986, p.173). In 1913 Reade was acting as Secretary of the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association and editing its magazine. He promoted the concept of a tour in Australasia and Mayor John Lavington Bonython of Adelaide supported the idea (Tregenza 2007, p.48). The outbreak of war in 1914 did not stop the tour and Reade used a controversial title to promote his lectures in Adelaide in October that year. This was “Garden Cities v. Adelaide Slums and Suburbs” with lantern photographs of Adelaide’s back yards and lanes compared with the garden suburbs of London. There was a predictable outcry from the Adelaide City Council with the Acting Mayor, Alderman Lewis Cohen, declaring that there were no “slums” in Adelaide and the City was the garden city of Australia because of the Park Lands.

However, articles in both *The Advertiser* (7 October 1914, p.5) and the *South Australian Register* (7 October 1914, p.6c) suggested there was some truth in Reade’s claims. Tregenza (2007, p. 50) states there were indeed groups of houses within walking distance of the Post Office that were scarcely fit for human habitation. Freestone (2010, p.214 citing Tregenza) asserts the city fathers were in self-denial about the situation. Mayor Isaacs later acknowledged that there were a few areas in the City which were of poor quality with decrepit cottages, but they were not “slums”. Victorian era Adelaide contained many narrow lanes and alleys which had been cut into Light’s original deep Town
Acres. Heritage consultants McDougall & Vines observe that the Town Acres were often subdivided into 12, but occasionally 26 lots, and this was the basis for overcrowding and the emergence of “slums” (McDougall & Vines, 1993, p.59). Cottages were often erected right onto these lanes which created the smaller lots and usually there were no backyards. These could fairly be classified as “slums” but Morton considers it is a matter of definition (Morton 1996, p.196).

Morton (1996, p.202) considers Reade was hostile towards dense living in the City. His work could be summarised as “one family, one home, one garden” and he exaggerated the case for decentralisation and the garden city ideal. Freestone (1989, p.42) observes that the density in the City in 1908 was 10.9 persons to the acre – the lowest of all the capital cities in Australia.

Reade offered to become an advisor to the South Australian government and in 1915 the newly elected Vaughan Labor Government appointed him as the Government Town Planner – another innovation; the first such appointment in Australia. In 1916 Reade prepared a Town Planning and Housing Bill which reflected the earlier British legislation but it contained some substantial new elements based on North American legislation (Hutchings 2007, p. 61). Freestone (1989, p.200) states this was the first town planning legislation in Australia. A central Town Planning Commission was proposed which would subordinate the role of local government to the State in the preparation of town planning schemes.

The Municipal Tramways Trust (MTT) was established in 1907 when private tramways were taken over by the State and the lines were electrified in 1914 (McDougall & Vines 1993, p.57). The MTT had the power to lay tracks without Adelaide City Council approval. When the Squares and Park Lands were dissected with new tracks the Council protested (Morton 1996, p.194). Town Clerk Ellery said that the legislation which had allowed this to happen was the most atrocious Act ever passed by the South Australian Parliament. The power proposed for the MTT appears not to have been appreciated by the City Council when the Bill was before the Legislative Council. However, this added to the argument against the proposed town planning legislation which provided for a State instrumentality with power over the City. It was seen by the Council as a challenge to its right to steer the destiny of the City (ibid p.195). Thus the Adelaide City Council became the greatest opponent of the Town Planning Bill and sought to amend the legislation to have the ability to carry out its own town planning scheme. When this was rejected by the State the City Council used its influence in the Legislative Council and after much debate the Bill was defeated.
Hart (Hart, Stuart, oh! 5 / 26: 31, Springfield, 5 April 2007) advises in relation to the City being excluded from State legislation:

There is a long history of the City being treated separately which can be traced back to the arrival of Reade and his publicised view that there were slums in the City of Adelaide. This had provoked intense feeling by the City Council and when the Town Planning Bill of 1916 (which lapsed) finally became law in 1920, the City of Adelaide was excluded. There are numerous other examples of the City having its own legislation, or being excluded from the provisions of other Acts, notably the Highways Act which meant that the Commissioner of Highways had no jurisdiction in the City.

Reade was responsible for organising the First Australian Town Planning Conference in Adelaide in 1917 and managed to bring together some 250 delegates, including Mayor Isaacs of Adelaide (Tregenza 2007, p.53). In support of the conference Reade prepared an exhibition which included an illustration of his ideas. Had his proposal for an outer belt of Park Lands (Figure 17) come to fruition, there would have been a substantial difference in the development of Adelaide’s metropolitan area.

![Figure 17 - Reade’s proposal for an outer belt of Park Lands](image)

Freestone (2010, p.140) asserts Reade’s scheme for the metropolitan area was innovative and was the first Australian metropolitan strategy, linking broad ideas to functional land use proposals. Whitelock (1977, p.187) observes that the rejection of Reade’s proposal for a second ring of Park Lands, when there was still space and time for them to be reserved, partly explains the strong community feeling for the protection of Light’s original Park Lands. Freestone (2010, p.243) observes there is longstanding resistance in Adelaide to any incursions into the Park Lands.

A more cautious Bill was introduced in 1919 which allowed local government to initiate its own planning schemes which could not be overridden by the State Government. After much debate in the Legislative Council the Town Planning Act, 1920 was passed but with the notable and predictable exception that the City of Adelaide was excluded from its provisions and the ability for the Government Town Planner to make town planning by-laws deleted. At issue was governance - the power of the State, through the Government Town Planner, to exercise central control over local government and the City Council had sufficient influence to ensure this did not happen as far as Adelaide was concerned. However, the Act did provide for the statutory recognition for the position of Government Town Planner and his Department but Hutchings (2007, p.68) states there were no technical means to achieve the Act’s goals.

Cheesman (1986, p.181) believes that Reade’s contribution to town planning in South Australia was a heritage of adaptive spatial planning on the ground combined with enthusiastic proposals for reform but he was frustrated by property owners’ hostile opposition to any form of development control. Reade’s work resulted in the Building Act, 1923 which did improve physical living conditions but there were long term implications of a minimum size building block in the City as the Adelaide City Council tried to balance residential, commercial and industrial uses (Morton 1996, p.203).

Reade left Adelaide in December 1920, a few days after the Act was passed, seeking new challenges in the Federated Malay States. Tregenza (2007, p.59) contends that while Reade raised the profile of town planning and achieved the support of the State he could not change the influence of the Adelaide City Council in the Legislative Council looking after the interests of City property owners. Sandercock (1975a, p.47) asserts that the departure of Reade was a major cause of the decline of town planning in South Australia in the 1920s.

Freestone (1989, p.170) asserts Reade’s plan for the suburb of Colonel Light Gardens was a showcase for the principles of the garden city movement. Freestone further observes Colonel Light
Gardens was Reade’s most important and complete physical legacy in Australia (Freestone 2010, p.179). Garnaut has also written extensively about Colonel Light Gardens and the contribution that Reade made in terms of the garden city movement in South Australia (Garnaut 1995, 1997, 2000, 2006; Hutchings & Garnaut 2009).

In this Section it has been argued that Charles Reade made an important contribution to town planning and the principles of the garden city movement in South Australia. But the governance of the City clearly remained with the Adelaide City Council in the exercise of its power with the State. Influences on the development of the metropolitan area after Reade’s departure will be examined in the next Section.

2.2.6 INFLUENCES IN ADELAIDE AFTER READE

Hutchings (2007, pp.61–83) provides a well-documented history of comprehensive town planning in South Australia and the influence the Government Town Planners Reade, Earle, Scott Griffiths and Day had on the development of the State from 1915 until the depression of the early 1930s.

William Earle was appointed as the Government Town Planner to follow Reade but resigned in 1922 after a brief period in office. He was followed by Walter Scott Griffiths who attempted some improvements to the legislation, including a form of zoning. However, his Amendment Bill of 1925 was seen by the Adelaide City Council and the Legislative Council to be a duplication of the Building Act, 1923. This Act provided the basis for dealing with new building materials and new technologies, particularly the complexities of reinforced concrete structures (McDougall & Vines 1993, p.60). The Amendment Bill prohibited the erection or alteration of certain classes of buildings and as this implied a form of zoning it was opposed by the City Council. Thus the Bill lapsed in the Legislative Council. Hart comments (Hart, Stuart, ohi 5 / 13:15, Springfield, 5 April 2007):

Reade was the first State Town Planner, followed by Earle, Scott Griffiths and Day. Reade’s planning legislation of 1920 was repealed in 1930 and the function became one of only controlling the subdivision of land.

Scott Griffiths died in office and was followed by Harold Day but when the Act was repealed in 1930 the Government Town Planner function was absorbed into the Registrar-General’s Office. The Labor Government had supported town planning as a comprehensive process but it lost the 1927 election to the Butler Liberal and Country Party Alliance. Post-1927, Hutchings (2007, p.71) states that town
planning had become no more than a means of controlling the subdivision of land. Sanderock (1975a, p.51) asserts that the forces of reaction in Adelaide had been mounting and the Town Planning Department was blamed for hindering the development of the State. The new conservative Government argued the familiar theme of town planning threatening the rights of people to profit from their property. Robson (1939, p.50) argues that governments have traditionally viewed the protection of property as more important than the provision of services or amenities.

Linn contends that the Adelaide City Council was not interested in the views of the Parliament or the public – it firmly believed that its view of what was right for the City was the only view that mattered (Linn 2006, p.16). In the 1920s the Council took on the task of dealing with the impact of motor vehicles. Adelaide had the advantage of the heritage of Light’s plan of regular street widths in excess of 31m (99 feet) which allowed for both moving lanes and parking bays. Few additional streets or radical changes were needed because of the grid but War Memorial Drive was constructed in 1919-25, mainly through a grant from the Commonwealth Government to employ returned soldiers. Thus the efforts in the City went mainly into upgrading, sealing and resurfacing and draining roads and established a strong engineering tradition within the Council (Morton 1996, p.207).

Sir John Lavington Bonython was a Methodist and typified the establishment families and the connections between the Adelaide City Council and business in the City in the 1920s. Bonython personally contributed £100,000 to complete the building of the Parliament House as the State was short of funds (Linn, 2006, p.10). As well as being Mayor he was the Editor of The Advertiser and served on many Boards, including being President of the Chamber of Commerce. Bonython was responsible for the appointment of William (Bill) Veale as the Adelaide City Engineer in 1929. This was an important choice as Veale’s personality and influence would shape the City over a long period of time (Linn 2006, p.17).

As South Australia emerged from the Depression the Government realised its overdependence on primary industry and set about the encouragement of manufacturing (Sandercock 1975a, p.52). Stretton (1975, p.132) argues that it was the industrial programme launched in 1934 which influenced and reshaped the metropolitan area in the absence of any conscious town planning. He also asserts that Adelaide’s success was attributable to the influence of a handful of educated men who were in charge of the State’s key public services in the 1930s (Stretton 1975, p.133).
Leslie Hunkin, the Public Service Commissioner, and John Wainwright, the Auditor-General, made a point of knowing gifted university students and arranging positions for them in the public service. Also in 1936 Hunkin and Wainwright, in another innovation, persuaded the Government to establish the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) to provide public housing before any other State established a similar entity (Sandercock 1975a, p.53; Stretton 1975, p.137). Alexander (Alex) Ramsay was one of the identified talents and he was educated at the University of Adelaide in Arts and Economics. At the age of 34 he was appointed as the General Manager of the SAHT in 1948. The SAHT was to play an influential role in the industrial growth of metropolitan Adelaide as has been well-documented in Marsden (1986). Stretton (1975, p.133) observes the old Adelaide establishment was actually an open oligarchy and willing to recruit talent to its ranks. It was therefore not surprising that Ramsay was elected a member of The Adelaide Club in 1961 (Morgan 1971, p.121).

As described earlier in terms of the governance of the City there was often an overlap between the membership of the City Council and the Parliament and this continued into the early 20th century. For example, Councillors Edwards and Dale served in the House of Assembly and Alderman Prosser served in the Legislative Council (Linn 2006, p.67). Alderman Tucker who was also an MP used his influence to be the architect of the Motor Traffic Regulation Act, 1904. This allowed the State to control motor traffic throughout the State as a By-Law proposed by the Council for this purpose in the City was declared ultra vires. Nevertheless, the City Council tried to balance the competing needs of motorists, pedestrians and cyclists with signs and road markings and zones were created for taxicabs, buses and trams (Morton 1996, p.230).

It has been argued in this Section there were a number of individuals who influenced the development of the metropolitan areas and that the City Council continued to maintain its influence in the Parliament and thus was in control of its own destiny. In the next Section the individual influence of Premier Tom Playford at the State level is examined.

2.2.7 THE INFLUENCE OF PREMIER TOM PLAYFORD

The Thomas (Tom) Playford era in South Australian politics has been well documented (Crocker 1983; Jaensch 1986; Cockburn 1991; Howell 1996). Cockburn describes Playford as a ‘benevolent despot’. Playford was from an old political family and grew up on the family farm in Norton Summit in the Adelaide Hills. After serving in the army in World War I he became interested in politics and won
the seat of Murray in 1933 as part of the Liberal and Country League (LCL). South Australia had an electoral bias in favour of rural areas since the passing of the Constitution Act, 1857. This was further enhanced in 1936 when legislation entrenched a gerrymander with a 2:1 ratio for electoral districts in favour of the country. 39 seats were established for the House of Assembly with 13 in the metropolitan area (15,605 voters each) and 26 in the country (5,718 voters each). Giddens (2002, p.69) notes that John Stuart Mill had argued that limitations should be imposed on democracy and had recommended that some electorates should have more votes than others so that “the wise and talented would have more influence than the ignorant and less able.” This would not have been in Playford’s mind – he was simply interested in maintaining his electoral advantage.

Playford won the seat of Gumeracha in March 1938 and he was subsequently appointed to the Butler Cabinet. In November 1938 Playford followed Butler as Premier. Playford served until March 1965 which established the longest continuous political leadership of 27 years in the British Commonwealth (Parliament of South Australia, 2009). Stretton (1975, p.142) observes nobody over-awed Playford and while the Premier respected property he was only impressed by wealth if it was in the form of productive investment. Cockburn (1991, p.215) states that Playford, although invited, never joined The Adelaide Club but would occasionally have lunch there with the LCL establishment. At the time of Playford’s election as Premier the LCL primarily comprised conservative pastoralists such as the Hawker, McLachlan and Angas families and old money such as the Rymill and Morphett families. They had been educated at Prince Alfred College (Methodist) or St Peter’s College (Church of England) and then at the University of Adelaide, often with a further qualification from Oxford or Cambridge. Cockburn (1991, p.213) further contends that Playford would have been uncomfortable in this company as he had no formal education, but he was recognised by them as an election winner who had no rival within the LCL parliamentary wing.

Morton observes that Adelaide was still a large country town in 1928. It was quiet and thinly populated and the rural sector still underpinned the State’s economy (Morton 1996, p.248). Playford converted this predominately rural-based economy into an industrial state with the pragmatic use of government resources. Marsden (1986) considers that under Playford the SAHT was the defacto planning authority for metropolitan Adelaide and was crucial to the Premier’s determination to transform a big country town into a metropolitan city through migration and industrial development. During Playford’s premiership compulsory voting was established and in another innovation women were admitted as Members of Parliament in 1959.
Rapid industrial development was stimulated by World War II and Playford was keen to see power and water schemes expanded to cope with the growth building on the development of the wartime munitions factories. Firms such as General Motors-Holden, ICI, Philips, Chrysler and British Tube Mills were persuaded by Playford to begin or expand their operations and Adelaide became a centre of Australia’s post war industrial boom (Forster & McCaskill in Hutchings 2007, p.85). However, the Adelaide Electric Supply Company (AESC) was a near-monopoly electricity supply company and insisted on using black coal from New South Wales rather than local brown coal from the Leigh Creek. Playford’s response, ever the pragmatist, was to present a Bill to Parliament in 1945 to nationalise the AESC and create the Electricity Trust of South Australia (ETSA) (Cockburn 1991, p.117). Initially the Bill failed to pass the Legislative Council where Playford had been unable to persuade a sufficient number of his LCL colleagues to support it as they considered it was undue interference in the economy. Playford continued to campaign on the issue as he saw it as critical for the development of the State, even if ideologically at odds with free enterprise.

By 1946 Playford had persuaded sufficient LCL members, with the support of four Labor Party members, for the Legislative Council to pass the Bill. ETSA was created becoming a major force in the post-war development of the State. Linn (1996) describes the story of electricity in South Australia and the crucial role that ETSA played in the State’s development.

Concerns about the condition of housing in the City, particularly in the south west, continued over the next few years until the outbreak of World War II when the Government commissioned an Inquiry. The report of the Inquiry was entitled ‘Substandard Housing Conditions in the Metropolitan Area’ (South Australian Parliamentary Paper No.32 1940, p.94). McDougall & Vines (1993, p.61) observe that in the Inquiry it was found that 39% of the 7,716 houses in Adelaide were substandard and unfit for human habitation.

The Building Act, 1940 was enacted which gave local government greater powers over new structures. Before the War ended the State recognised the need for a substantial amount of new housing and as a result of the Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement the SAHT received £100,000 to demolish slums and build new houses within the Adelaide metropolitan area (The Advertiser 18 March 1936, p.14).

The use of the Park Lands was an ongoing issue but an amendment to the Municipal Corporations Act, 1925 allowed the Council to designate areas of the Park Lands for the temporary parking of
motor vehicles in support of activities such as the Royal Show (Morton 1996, p.246). In the 1930s the use of the Park Lands for sport on Sundays caused controversy. The strong Protestant ethic, particularly of the Methodists, came to the fore with their strict view of observance of the Sabbath and strong opposition to gambling and the consumption of alcohol. Indeed, the Methodists had urged for decades the importance of electing to the City Council and the Parliament those who favoured these strict views (Linn 2006, p.112). A deputation from the Council of Churches, without the Catholics who were less strict about such matters, met with the Lord Mayor to argue their case. The problem emerged as being what was defined as organised sport compared to the recreational use of the Park Lands. In September 1939 the Council emphasised its governance over the Park Lands and adopted a Regulation which controlled sport in the Park Lands and banned any organised games being played on a Sunday (Linn 2006, p.113).

In this Section it has been argued Playford exercised considerable influence in the State, particularly on the development of the metropolitan area. Within the City there was growing concern about the state of residential property and with the use of the Park Lands. The influence of Town Clerk Bill Veale in the City is addressed in the next Section.

2.2.8 THE INFLUENCE OF TOWN CLERK BILL VEALE

William (Bill) Veale returned from the War as a Brigadier and resumed his position as City Engineer. In 1947 he was appointed as the Town Clerk. Linn states that Veale was a strict disciplinarian and a stubborn character. He operated a military style of command so that only he, in deference to the Council, spoke to the Lord Mayor, Aldermen and Councillors. Veale was used to getting his way and did not hesitate to argue with the elected members if they disagreed with him (Linn 2006, p.131).

Veale, as the Town Clerk of the City, came to exert considerable individual influence over the planning and evolution of post-war Adelaide. Veale was elected a member of The Adelaide Club in 1951. He was then able to mix informally with the leaders of the business community in a social setting as well as in the more formal setting of the Town Hall (Morgan 1971, p.117). The key issue for Veale was the implementation of the State’s report on housing. Controls were exercised under the Building Act, Health Act and Local Government Act as there was no planning legislation (McDougall & Vines 1993, p.63). Veale’s solution to the housing problem was to pressure the Council to use a By-

49 Adelaide City Archives, Town Clerk’s File 292A.
Law to rezone South Adelaide from residential to industrial. Thus the slums would be cleared away and land made available for commercial and industrial buildings.\(^{50}\)

Not all members of Council, especially Edwards, were in agreement with Veale’s view about rezoning but Veale had the majority of elected members onside and by 1949 the City Building Surveyor had drawn up a By-Law for the rezoning proposal of South Adelaide to a “Factory Area”. Edwards well understood that the proposal would ensure that all residents in South Adelaide would eventually leave and his electorate would change substantially. But Veale was adamant that the City had to be cleaned up and the Zoning By-Law would not only remove the poverty stricken slums but provide new employment opportunities. The Council was making a clear policy statement that the residents had to be relocated and that the land in South Adelaide was far more valuable as industrial and commercial property. Playford was developing the new satellite town of Elizabeth to the north of the City to accommodate the workers for the industrial firms he had attracted to the State. This will be discussed in more detail in Section 2.3.3. Veale argued that the SAHT was also providing public housing for low income earners in Elizabeth and therefore alternative residential accommodation to the City was available. However, Veale warned the Council that the Premier was ensuring that all available building material, which was in short supply, was going to Elizabeth and thus there was a limitation on any construction in South Adelaide (Linn 2006, p.143).

Besides his concerns for the removal of slums, Veale, with his engineering background, was also convinced that Adelaide needed well designed roads as the principal corridors of communication. The State was expressing the view that the Council needed to take action to alleviate the worsening traffic congestion in the City, particularly the main north-south thoroughfare of King William Street. Veale’s solution, in March 1947, soon after he was appointed as the Town Clerk, was to propose to the Council that a new north-south road should be constructed (Linn 2006, pp.152-54). This would eventually link Main North Road in the north-east with Glen Osmond Road in the south-east with an extension of Frome Road from North Terrace to South Terrace (Figure 18).

Veale’s bold plan entailed the purchase of large amounts of real estate and the widening of some existing sections of the route. It was adopted by the Council as a project and the new Frome Street was to be implemented progressively over time. This was to have a major physical and social impact in both North Adelaide and South Adelaide in the late 1960s and early 1970s as its implementation

\(^{50}\) Adelaide City Archives, Town Clerk’s Special File 229B – Zoning and Housing.
Bowen considers Veale was a major influence in the City (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 /8:15, College Park, 16 April 2007):

It was important to recognise the influence of Town Clerk Bill Veale. He had been the City Engineer before becoming Town Clerk. He was critical of Colonel Light’s plan for the City because the major streets ran east-west whereas the geographic constraints of the sea and the hills clearly provided for a north south linear metropolitan city. Veale was convinced of the need for another north-south road through the City, partly to relieve the pressure of growing traffic on King William Street in the centre of the City. Buying properties to provide such a new road became a key Council policy.

Figure 18 - Veale’s plan for a new north-south road on the eastern side of the City
Source: Adelaide City Archives with names added by the researcher

The world wide trend of the move from public transport to private motor vehicles reached Adelaide in the late 1940s. In 1947 the Government appointed a Royal Commission to report on State transport services as the number of motor vehicles in Adelaide had doubled and the usage of public transport had halved (Linn 2006, p.155). The Council appointed a Special Committee to give evidence to the Royal Commission. The members of this Special Committee met with Municipal Tramways Trust, the Railways, the Highways Department and the Royal Automobile Association before giving evidence to the Royal Commission. The Council’s position was that it was to have the governance of all transport matters within the City, even if this required additional powers from the Government (Linn 2006, p.155).
1950 was a critical year for planning in Adelaide and South Australia and ends the period that this Chapter covers. Lloyd Dumas, the Editor of *The Advertiser* invited Professor Denis Winston, the recently appointed Chair of the new Department of Town and Country Planning at Sydney University, to come to Adelaide and provide some advice on the future planning of the City (*The Advertiser*, 15 July 1950, p.5). Winston’s report emphasised the need for control over development and was a major impetus for a new approach to the development of the City within a metropolitan context over the next two decades (Linn 2006, p.145).

In this Section the considerable individual influence that was exercised by Town Clerk Bill Veale on the housing and transport policies of the Council has been examined. These policies were to have a substantial impact on the City in the 1960s and 1970s.

### 2.2.9 SUMMARY

This Chapter has described the growth and development of the City and State from 1840 until 1950. The governance of the City was the underling tension between the two bodies. The heritage of the City’s Park Lands was affected when they were alienated for various uses authorised by the State. Reade was an individual of influence. He was the first Government Town Planner when town planning and the garden city movement began to have an impact on the City and metropolitan Adelaide in the early 20th century. Two major figures emerged in the 1930s who were to have considerable influence as individuals in the governance of the City and State. Sir Thomas (Tom) Playford was Premier of the State of South Australia from 1938 to 1965 and W. C. D. (Bill) Veale was the City Engineer from 1929 and then the Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide from 1947 until 1965. They brought about substantial changes to the State and the City and to all intents and purposes Playford was the Government (Sandercock 1975a, p. 110) and Veale was the Council (Linn 2006, p.131). The loss of residents through the zoning of South Adelaide and the transportation policies of the Council and the Government were the emerging planning issues for the City that were to dominate the 1950s and 1960s. These will be examined in the next Chapter.
CHAPTER 2.3

Changing attitudes to planning the City and State from 1950 until 1972; governance and influence

International context - influences - innovation and difference - transportation policies - public participation - resident action - changing approaches to city planning

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter examines and analyses the changes which occurred in the City and State from 1950 until 1972 within an international context of new attitudes and concerns about the nature of city planning and the need for public involvement in the process. It sets the scene in terms of governance and influence for an innovative and different approach to city planning that began in the City of Adelaide in 1972 and which will be argued in detail in Part Three of this thesis.

2.3.2 THE INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT AFTER WORLD WAR II

The Modern Movement, described as a rational, functional approach to urban design, was embraced in the 1930s in France, Germany, The Netherlands, and Sweden. The Modern Movement’s principal aim was to find physical forms appropriate to an industrial society. But it was not until after WWII, when there was a need for substantial rebuilding in Britain and Europe, that architects and planners saw the future in terms of the ideas of the Modern Movement’s leaders, Le Corbusier and Gropius (Ward 2004, pp. 58-62).

Le Corbusier (1923,1927,1929) had come to the conclusion that the existing city had become functionally obsolete due to increasing size and congestion at the centre; congestion could be cured by creating even higher densities using taller buildings with increased open space around them; the pressure on inner cities could be eliminated by creating a series of high density nodes separated by open space; and the new physical urban form could accommodate new and highly efficient forms of transport, both public and private.

Le Corbusier’s proposal for a city of towers (1923, pp.54 -59) was a design for 60 storey high buildings set in clean air amidst trees and grass (Figure 19). The buildings would be removed from all the existing dust, smells and noise. Residents and office workers would enjoy views of gardens...
and playing fields. It was a new system of town planning with motorways allowing the easy and rapid circulation of traffic and with flats, opening to light and air, replacing slums on the ground.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 132 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 19 - Le Corbusier’s City of Towers
Source: Towards a new Architecture, Le Corbusier 1923, p.55

Boyer (1994, pp.45-51) observes Le Corbusier had argued that the world had been transformed by the elevated highway which enabled housing to be concentrated in residential towers with nature touching the base of every building. Order was created with skyscraper towers in a checkerboard grid. However, Bacon (1968, p.217) asserts Le Corbusier had a disastrous effect on the architectural profession as the design of buildings could be treated separately from their context. The result has been buildings designed independent of the environment and society has paid a great price for this separation because the total environment has suffered. Stretton (1978, p.164) argues that architects had believed in modernist theories, such as those of Le Corbusier, without doing any social or economic research and consequently the physical results became discredited.

A whole generation of architects and planners were imbued with the philosophies of Le Corbusier and his contemporaries. After WWII the urgent need to rebuild devastated cities provided the opportunity to put the urban renewal theories of the Modern Movement into practice.

In a world seeking a new order, there was little resistance to radical innovation. Peel (1995, p.21) contends the practical work of town planning and reconstruction after WWII in Britain drew heavily on
sources such as Le Corbusier and Gropius. There was a genuine belief that the physical form and technological achievement provided a response to the economic, social and physical ills of existing cities and the tower block solution became the norm.

The British *Town and Country Planning Act, 1947* resulted in a new interest in physical and economic planning. The arguments for comprehensive development were supported by the dramatic post war growth in the use of the private motor vehicle but this put pressure on inner city movement corridors. The creation of efficient transport networks became an imperative within an integrated approach to wholesale urban renewal. Part of Cumbernauld New Town in Scotland (*Figure 20*) is a typical example of the realisation of Le Corbusier’s original ideas.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 133 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

*Figure 20* – Cumbernauld New Town: Tower blocks and motorways
Source: Obtained from the Cumbernauld Development Corporation by the researcher in 1969

Buchanan (1963) pointed out that growing affluence and the private use of the car was creating a public problem. The capacity of towns to absorb traffic was not infinite and his report, *Traffic in Towns*, provided the impetus for thinking about land use and transport together. The national government gave strong support to central area redevelopment and in Britain between 1955 and 1974, 1.1 million dwellings were demolished and 3.1 million people were rehoused (Ward 2004, p.140). The *Parker Morris Report*, published in 1961 suggested higher space standards for dwellings which added to the pressures for high rise solutions to minimise the impact on green belts. The inner city residential schemes were invariably developed by local government where the architectural
visions and use of industrial building materials resulted in prefabricated high rise blocks which reflected modern thinking and technology as well as growing the materials and energy industry businesses (Ward 204, p.142).

Antoniou (1971) examines the impact of freeways (motorways) in a number of case studies in the USA, Britain and Europe and reviews the amount of space being devoted to vehicles in cities compared to the physical environment for pedestrians. He asserts that while Le Corbusier foresaw the scale of development for moving vehicles and housing people, Le Corbusier failed to appreciate the extent of the private use of the motor car and the impact this would have. Antoniou analyses the actions taken in cities, which he terms 'environmental management', to provide pedestrian facilities which are safe and easy to use. Antoniou reviews three examples where different approaches were used to address Le Corbusier’s principle of separating pedestrians from traffic and asserts the real issue is the precedence given to the movement of cars rather than pedestrians. In the City of London a pedestrian network was progressively put in place at the first floor level as sites were developed after WWII when a considerable amount of reconstruction was needed. In comparison, the pedestrian network in the centre of the City of Philadelphia in Society Hill is provided at grade through the middle of street blocks. Thus the driver has to get out of the car and become a pedestrian to appreciate the historic area. In the City of Montreal, because of the fierce weather, a pedestrian network is provided underground which links hotels, theatres, shops and subway stations.

On an overseas study tour Hugh Bubb, who was appointed the City Engineer and Surveyor of Adelaide in 1965, was impressed with this solution in Montreal and an underground pedestrian network became an element of his plans for Adelaide. Bubb’s influence in the City will be examined in Section 2.3.5 of this Chapter.

Ward (2004, pp. 261-287) argues that the redevelopment of cities provided centres of innovation which were physically attractive and ensured services for the citizens. The pre-eminence of central areas reflected their optimum accessibility within a city based on public transport. However, redevelopment in the central areas saw the loss of corner shops, pubs and small business as residents moved into high rise towers. At the same time, the development of outer suburbs was predominantly by private sector developers, assisted by mortgage lenders and the private use of the

---

51 The researcher worked for Antoniou in the City of London designing the city's pedestrian network.
Patterns of urban change were essentially shaped by powerful economic, social and political processes beyond the control of town planners.

Le Corbusier believed a new dignity would be brought to the city if a geometrical configuration was imposed upon it. However, the straight line and right angle of the grid ruthlessly separated functional areas (Boyer 1994, p.122). Young & Willmott (1957) in Britain and Jacobs (1961) in the USA have written extensively about the profound impacts of dispersing communities resulting from comprehensive redevelopment schemes. Jacobs (1961) was particularly critical of Le Corbusier’s theories in her seminal work *The Life and Death of Great American Cities*, but it was not until the late 1960s and early 1970s that architects and planners generally began to question the philosophies of the Modern Movement and seek alternative development solutions. Leslie Martin founded the Centre for Land Use and Built Form Studies at Cambridge University in 1967 and significant research was carried out into different forms of urban systems using the rapidly increasing power of computers. Martin, and his protégé Sandy Wilson, had lost faith in the Modern Movement and played significant roles in the collapse of technocratic solutions (Haigh 2007, p.141). The spatial relationship between housing, transport and employment had to be addressed in a more consultative way with the public involved in the planning process.

The renewal theories of the Modern Movement have been reviewed in this Section as they provide important background for the situation which emerged in Adelaide in the 1950s and the preparation of a plan for the Adelaide metropolitan area. This will be examined in the next Section.

### 2.3.3 THE ADELAIDE METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Sandercock’s work *Cities for sale; property, politics and urban planning in Australia* (1975a) was directly derived from her doctoral dissertation. It is a Marxist perspective of capitalism but it does provide insights into the politics of planning in Australia, including Adelaide, during the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, and is a widely known publication. Sandercock (1975a, pp.110-112) contends that by the early 1950s Premier Playford had diversified the old power elite that had centred around the former Adelaide establishment families in Adelaide whose wealth derived from land, commerce and banking. However, Playford was at one with the establishment to retain a conservative political structure and

---

52 Professor Sir Leslie Martin held the Chair of Architecture at the University of Cambridge from 1956 to 1972.
53 Colin St John (Sandy) Wilson succeeded him as Professor of Architecture at Cambridge from 1976.
54 The researcher read Architecture at Cambridge University under Professor Martin; Wilson was then a Lecturer.
he used the establishment’s money to finance his economic objectives for the State. In this context, in 1955, a somewhat reluctant Playford introduced an amendment to the *Town Planning Act, 1929* which provided for a Town Planning Committee to be appointed with responsibility for preparing a development plan for the metropolitan area (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.87). Sandercock (1975a, p.115) observes there was the usual opposition in the Legislative Council to the legislation based on the familiar theme of interference with property rights but there was also a concern that land for subdivision had to be capable of being economically supplied with water and sewerage.

Playford had been persuaded to introduce the legislation by a personal friend, [Sir] Lloyd Dumas. A few influential people in South Australia, especially Dumas, were aware of a new approach in the British *Town and Country Planning Act, 1947* and had become concerned about the lack of a plan to guide the growth of Adelaide. Dumas was the Chairman of the Board of *The Advertiser* and financed a visit to Adelaide by Denis Winston, recently appointed as the founding Chair of Town and Country Planning at the University of Sydney. Winston wrote a series of articles in *The Advertiser* explaining the hazards of haphazard growth and the need for a plan. The Town Planning Institute of SA had been formed in 1948 and Town Clerk Bill Veale was elected as its first President. The Institute had also called for a plan for the development of metropolitan Adelaide (Sandercock 1975a, p.113).

Peel (1995, pp.33-36) contends the State Government decided to build a British-style new town in South Australia. Within the metropolitan area north of Adelaide farmland was bought by the South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) in 1949 for the new town of Elizabeth which was meant to be self-contained with its own centre. Playford had created the SAHT in 1936 to provide the housing arm of the State’s low wages and low cost industrialisation policy. A major impetus for the SAHT in the 1950s was controlling the costs of suburban expansion, especially in terms of public services like electricity, water and transport. The SAHT was responsible for providing thirty percent of dwellings in the metropolitan area and they were inexpensive to rent. Thus living costs and wages would be lower in Adelaide than in Sydney or Melbourne (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.86). Elizabeth was designed under Henry Smith and based on the British new town concept of comprehensively planned neighbourhoods (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.87). Freestone (2010, p.152) states the original plan for Elizabeth envisaged five neighbourhoods of about five thousand persons, each with their own primary schools and shopping centres. Peel (1995 p.44) contends Smith was influenced by the work of Ebenezer Howard and the layouts of the British new towns of Letchworth and Welwyn. Australia’s town planners looked to their Anglo- North American counterparts for ideas about urban form and the British concept of town design became cemented in Australian planning ideology and practice (Peel
1995, p.13). The design of Elizabeth, the only new town in Australia that came close to British new
towns, was based on the principles of the ideal community being in neighbourhoods and private
interests contributing to rational development rather than working against it (ibid, p.31). Companies
expanded in Elizabeth which resulted in the need for more labour which in turn attracted more
migration and the demand for further housing (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.85).

Stuart Hart was working as the Deputy Planning Officer in Fife, Scotland when he saw an
advertisement inviting applications to prepare a plan for metropolitan Adelaide. Hart, who had
previously worked with Bristol County Borough and Warwickshire County Council, was appointed as
the Director of Planning in South Australia in 1957 (Cheesman 1986, p 223). Hart (Hart, Stuart, ohi 5
/ 9:11, Springfield, 18 April 200) recalls how he came to Adelaide:

I saw a small advertisement in ‘The Daily Telegraph’ for a position which involved the
preparation of a plan for metropolitan Adelaide. I applied and was eventually interviewed in
London by a panel which included Lord Holford. I was offered the job of Director of Planning
and I arrived in Adelaide with my family in January 1957.

The Town Planning Committee consisted of Hart who, as the new Director of Planning, was
Chairman; Bill Veale the Adelaide Town Clerk who was the President of the Planning Institute and the
former City Engineer; Jack Cheesman, an architect; James Murrell, an engineer with the Engineering
and Water Supply Department; and Harold Tyler, the Town Clerk of Enfield. Veale and Cheesman
were both members of The Adelaide Club (Morgan, 1971). Sandercock (1975a, p.126) observes that
the Committee of five, which included two engineers and an architect, was heavily orientated towards
planning as being concerned with technical efficiency. The Committee was to assess the
metropolitan area and provide for development to be in the best interests of the community.
Specifically it was to give advice on highways, open space and areas for industrial development.

Hart was assisted by a small technical team under Chief Planner Hans Westerman and by many
volunteers who produced a wealth of information in the form of maps, photos, tables and text. The
volunteers included geography students from the University of Adelaide who prepared a
comprehensive land use survey of all land and buildings in the metropolitan area (Forster & McCaskill
2007, p.88). As a result, the Town Planning Committee was able to produce a detailed 300-page
of a linear city from Gawler in the north to Sellicks Beach in the south with the City and six district
centres one of which was Elizabeth. Private development on the western face of the Mount Lofty
Ranges was to be controlled with tight restrictions on the area to be known as The Hills Face Zone.
The protection of The Hills Face Zone was important to the City Council as a backdrop to the City
Buttrose (1971) later researched the concept of The Hills Face Zone and highlighted the importance of its statutory planning provisions for the metropolitan area. The Report restated many of Reade’s ideas for the metropolitan area as discussed in the last Chapter and also called for special attention to north-south freeways capable of carrying large volumes of traffic into the City (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.89).

The relationship between Hart and Veale is important regarding the preparation of the Metropolitan Development Plan in terms of the influence of individuals and the governance of the City. Hart (Hart, Stuart, oh! 5 / 39:46, Springfield, 18 April 2007) reveals an interesting aspect of their relationship:

Soon after I arrived in Adelaide, Bill Veale invited me to a private luncheon in his office in the Town Hall every Tuesday where we had “a sherry and sandwiches” until Veale retired. When Veale was in America on a trip in 1957 he sent back an enormous amount of information to me and asked me to summarise it for him. While this was quite a task, particularly as I was still finding my feet in my own job, I did find it very interesting and useful as I was able to compare American practice with my own planning background in the UK.

Cheesman (1986, p.224) observes Hart’s concept for the metropolitan area recognised the physical constraints of the north-south plain with the Adelaide Hills to the east and Gulf St Vincent to the west. The spatial proposal of a series of districts connected in a linear arrangement on a rapid transit spine was innovative and unprecedented at the time. Freestone (2010, p.153) contends the plan was a sign-post for the corridor city which was to become the dominant planning paradigm of the 1970s. Cheesman asserts (1986, pp.225-226) that when Westerman left Adelaide and joined the National Capital Development Commission in Canberra he took Hart’s concept with him and this resulted in the linear spatial plan for Canberra where the districts were nominated as new towns.

Hart was faced with an unsympathetic government, an apathetic public and various strong-willed property interests. He spent an enormous amount of time promoting the advantages of town planning. Forster & McCaskill (2007, p.89) contend the Report was cautious rather than visionary but it was realistic in view of the strong tradition of hostility by the Adelaide establishment towards the very notion of control over private development. Sandercock (1975a, p.117) asserts that Hart received no encouragement from Playford who warned Hart of the usual opposition from property interests, particularly the Adelaide City Council. Thus the cautious recommendations needed to be seen in the context of Playford’s advice and the history of the demise of planning in the 1920s as discussed in the last Chapter. Hart’s own view was that a development plan must be acceptable and workable and to that end judgement must be based on what can or cannot be done within the prevailing economic, social and political situation (Hart 1972, pp.18-24).
In the 1962 Report a population of 1.3 million was projected by 1991. The prevailing low density housing would be continued but with a few areas of higher density, especially around the outside of the Park Lands. The original population of Elizabeth was to be 25,000 but the General Manager of the SAHT, Ramsay, changed this to 50,000 as the Report confidently predicted jobs for 60,000 in the Elizabeth/Salisbury area and Elizabeth would grow as the population in the City declined (Peel 1995, p.139).

An editorial in The Advertiser commented on the Report and that the new outlook on town planning in the community was a personal tribute to the Government Town Planner (Hart). His belief in the ultimate power of reason had made enough sense to enough people to swing the tide his way (The Advertiser, 24 November 1964, p.7). The Report incorporated the principles of the Development Plan system from Britain, the zoning system from the USA, and the appeal system from New Zealand (Hart 1978, p.53).

The Town Planning Act, 1956 provided for the Metropolitan Development Plan to include all local government areas except Adelaide which, as usual, had been excluded by the Legislative Council through the influence of the City Council. Thus there was an internal contradiction in the legislation. In 1957 Hart arranged for an amendment to the Act so that the exemption for the City remained except for Sections 26, 27 and 28 of the Act which dealt with the preparation of a Metropolitan Development Plan (Hart, Stuart, ohi 5 / 33:35, Springfield, 18 April 2007). This was to prove critical when Hart's plan was prepared in relation to the zoning for the City.

Playford was defeated in the 1965 election and the new Labor Government under Premier Frank Walsh put in place the legislation for the Metropolitan Development Plan. The then Attorney-General, Don Dunstan, introduced the Planning and Development Bill into the House of Assembly in February 1966. Murray Hill (a former member of the Adelaide City Council) opposed the Bill in the Legislative Council as he considered too much power would be given to the proposed State Planning Authority (SPA) (Sandercock 1975a, p.126; Dunstan 1981 p.184). However, after considerable debate the Planning and Development Act, 1967 was passed by the Legislative Council and came into effect on 1 July 1967. This legislation gave the Metropolitan Development Plan the status of authorised government policy and established the SPA with the Director of Planning as its Chairman (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.90). The Adelaide City Council again used its influence in the Legislative Council to ensure that the Council was represented on the SPA even though the SPA had no power over the City.
Hart (Hart, Stuart, ohi 5 / 47:49, Springfield, 18 April 2007) came to appreciate the influence of the Adelaide City Council and observes:

One seat on the 11 member State Planning Authority was reserved for a member of the Adelaide City Council and this was filled from 1967 to 1971 by John Roche, from 1971 to 1981 by John Chappel, and from 1981 to 1982 by Keith Shaw, even though the City had its own legislation from 1972.

The Act also established the planning powers and responsibilities of local government, except the City, as distinctly subordinate to those of the State. Councils had an obligation to produce Regulations to control development in their areas and these Regulations had to be consistent with the Metropolitan Development Plan. They also had to be uniform, which stifled any attempts at the local level to have variations appropriate to local conditions (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.88).

The 1962 Report had significant implications for the City in terms of zoning and transportation. It was estimated that by 1991 some 81% of South Adelaide would be required for central area functions and the whole area was zoned as a Central Business Zone (Figure 21). There would be an increase in the City’s workforce from 80,000 in 1967 to 150,000 in 1991. Transportation was to be facilitated by a radial network of Metropolitan Freeways which would converge on the City (Government of South Australia, 1962).

The Adelaide City Council passed a zoning By-Law in 1955 which substantially decreased the residential area in South Adelaide between the four Terraces. Veale had pursued the rezoning with determination and large portions of residential South Adelaide were faced with demolition.

Norman Young was a notable businessman and a member of the City Council who was concerned that if a residential population remained in South Adelaide there would be conflict with the expanding needs of business and light industry (Linn 2006, p.187). Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 47:54, College Park, 16 April 2007) considers Young was a possible influence on Hart:

I suspect that Norman Young, who was the Chairman of the Council’s Finance Committee and sat on innumerable Boards around town, had been an influence on the young Stuart Hart’s thinking about the City when preparing the Metropolitan Development Plan. Norman’s only criteria for development were what the market place wanted to do, and the best thing was to bowl over the cottages, get the people out and bring the cars in.

Playford said in Parliament (South Australian Parliamentary Debates, Hansard, 19 May 1955):

Many of the premises being demolished are sub-standard and occupying valuable land. For thousands of years the practice has been to pull down old buildings to make way for new structures. That is an advance we should not try to stop artificially.
Figure 21 - Zoning for the City with all of South Adelaide zoned commercial (dark blue)
Source: Metropolitan Development Plan 1962
Stewart Cockburn writing in _The Advertiser_ warned of the loss of residential land and expressed concern at the number of small businesses and light industries being established in South Adelaide (_The Advertiser_, 10 July 1956, p.17). John Chappel (Chappel, John, ohi 2 / 26:28, Kent Town, 13 April 2007) attributes another factor to the loss of residential population from South Adelaide and contends:

> Another factor in the decline of the residential population of the City was the lending policy of the Banks. While you could get a mortgage for a new house, it was impossible to get one on an old existing house, particularly in the City.

The staff of the Council’s City Engineer and Surveyor (Bubb) had commenced a Land Use Survey of the City in 1965 and prepared detailed projections of City employment and population needs. They reached the conclusion that some 500 acres (202 ha.) in South Adelaide would _not_ be needed for commercial purposes as zoned in the Metropolitan Development Plan and that further consideration should be given to residential uses. The same view was expressed by a visiting UK planner as Bob Bakewell (Bakewell, Bob, ohi 11 / 33:35, Adelaide, 24 June 2007) recalls:

> I had shown the distinguished UK planner Lord Llewelyn-Davies around Adelaide on one occasion and I remember he made the point that the area inside the Terraces zoned for CBD uses was far too large.

The City Engineer and Surveyor published “Planning Report no. 4 - _The Guidance of Land Use Development_” in February 1969 and prepared a “Functional Plan” for the members of the Council in July 1969. Bubb recommended the Council should either enact Regulations to implement the provisions of the Metropolitan Development Plan, or prepare a Supplementary Development Plan to amend the zoning. This was to have major implications for Council policy as will be discussed later in Section 2.3.5 of this Chapter.

The Government released the _Report on the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide_ (Town Planning Committee, 1962) but did little except appoint another committee to consider the transport implications. This committee consisted of the Commissioner of Highways (Chairman), the Commissioner of Railways, the General Manager of the Tramways Trust and the Town Clerk.

Davison (2004) states the use of traffic consultants from the USA was widespread in Australian capital cities in the 1960s. In Adelaide the committee engaged a consortium from the USA of De Leuw Cather & Co., Rankine & Hill, and A M Vorhees & Associates to examine the freeway proposals in the Metropolitan Development Plan and prepare the Metropolitan Adelaide Transport Study (MATS).
In this Section the factors leading to the preparation of a plan for the Adelaide metropolitan area under the influence of Hart have been examined. It is asserted Veale, and possibly elected members of the Council, exerted influence on Hart and the whole of South Adelaide was zoned for commercial uses within this plan. Later this was to have importance consequences for the governance of the City. Initially, the only action arising from the 1962 Report was a transport study (MATS) which will be examined in the next Section.

2.3.4 METROPOLITAN ADELAIDE TRANSPORTATION STUDY

While the MATS Report was commissioned by the Labor Government its results were not available until after the 1968 election when Labor was defeated and the Steele Hall Liberal Government came to power. The Report was released in August 1968 and enthusiastically supported by the Steele Hall Government, especially the new Minister of Transport Murray Hill who, with other conservative landholders, had opposed the recent planning legislation in the Legislative Council (Peel 1995, p.33).

The MATS Report recommended 156 kilometres of new freeways. As with similar reports at the same time for other Australian capital cities, consultants based in the USA saw freeways as the prime technical solution to growing traffic volumes and problems. Meyer, Kain & Wohl (1966, p.361) state that after WWII public transport became specialised for commuter trips as it was disadvantaged against the use of the private car for shopping, social and recreational trips. They also consider there was a convergence of public policy with economic and demographic development which increased the attractiveness of suburban living and the private use of the motor car (Meyer, Kain & Wohl 1966, p.362). Davison (2004) contends planning for private cars came to dominate transportation policies for cities.

Harwood & Boyce (1959, p.116) argue that no attention was given to the use of freeways in relation to land use because freeway planning agencies were not given broad urban planning responsibilities. Thus there was no machinery for an integrated approach to land use/transportation planning. They comment on the importance of providing off street parking to serve the central area to meet the increased demand arising from ease of access with the provision of a freeway system. However, they also note the extent of interference between land use functions because of the space taken up by the freeways themselves (ibid, pp.121-125).
The MATS Report stated that the principal objective of the study was to maintain the vitality of the City by providing convenient access to the central area. The recommended solution was to provide an adequate traffic service with minimum disturbance to the Park Lands (MATS Report 1968, p.161). The freeway system, complemented by an arterial road network, was to ensure easy access to the City from all directions. The system was designed to divert a substantial portion of through traffic away from the four Terraces of the City and the City streets (ibid 1968, p.163). The freeway engineers’ solution was to separate through traffic, defined as not stopping in the CBD, from traffic which was bound for the CBD by proposing freeways at the edge of the area with feeder roads into the CBD (Meyer, Kain & Wohl 1966, p.362).

Within the city itself the MATS Report recommended the completion of the Council’s plan for Frome Road/Frome Street to improve arterial continuity and north-south capacity but with a minor amendment at the eastern end of North Adelaide; instead of using Margaret Street proposed by the Council, Le Fevre Terrace would be widened and extended. It would be realigned to link with Frome Road which involved the removal of the historic Albert Bridge. Goodwood Road would be realigned through the Park Lands and Hutt Street expanded north to Botanic Road through the Park Lands (Figure 22). The total costs of the City improvements were estimated to be $3.5 million (MATS Report 1968, p.165).

As well as the freeways and parking proposals the MATS Report did propose an improvement to the public transport system. A new subway was proposed north-south along King William Street with three stations in the city. One would be at the junction with Rundle Street, one in the vicinity of Victoria Square, and one immediately north of South Terrace as also shown in Figure 22. The Yonge Street subway in Toronto was cited as an example of the advantages of passenger distribution along a subway line with an increase in land values and new commercial buildings being built, suggesting similar benefits could flow in Adelaide (MATS Report 1968, p.178).

The MATS Report (1968, p.167) also confirmed the findings of the 1964 Wilbur Smith & Associates Report which had been commissioned by the Adelaide City Council regarding parking in the City. This Report had estimated that 2,500 additional short term parking spaces would be required by 1986 with 15,300 long term spaces. Five inner city sites had been identified for this extra parking which were all considered to be vital for the recommended overall transportation system. The estimated total cost of this land and building programme was $30 million (MATS Report 1968, p.171).
Davison (2004, pp.168-170) asserts Australian engineers and planners were influenced by the North American approach to traffic analysis and the design of freeways. Rod Payze (who was to become Director of Transport and a member of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission) thinks the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study was a reflection of the consultants who were engaged to provide advice on the transport requirements for Adelaide from the early 1970s until the year 1986. Payze (Payze, Rob, oral history 44 / 17:24, Hyde Park, 19 May 2008) observes:

It was a study heavily orientated towards a supply side transport solution based on a network of freeways. There was also a mass transit provision for a City which at the time only had a population of 700,000. The relationship between the way in which the City grew and formed, and the provision for transport accessibility was a big issue and extensively debated.
In summary, the *MATS Report* stressed the advantages of the private car providing a door-to-door service and not being tied to schedules or pre-selected routes while public transport was ideally suited for the mass movement of people to and from high density areas during peak hours. It was assumed there would be a doubling of traffic by 1986 and therefore an extensive system of freeways and arterial roads was needed. The freeway was a major innovation in highway design and had two functions in a metropolitan area. Firstly, it separated through traffic from local traffic and could therefore move large volumes at high speeds. Secondly, it provided rapid and convenient accessibility between various parts of the metropolitan area. The *Report* claimed that the recommended system would guide the objectives of the *Metropolitan Development Plan*. It would be a positive means of directing and shaping urban growth to provide desired economic and social benefits. Improved public transport would provide a supplementary service to the freeways and with improved accessibility, the CBD would continue as the commercial, retail and cultural centre of the metropolitan area (*MATS Report*, p178).

The *MATS Report* was released to the public on 12 August 1968 (Linn 2006, p.209). While it was a triumph of technocratic planning it had been prepared without any community consultation. The freeways had been planned in detail with great engineering precision but without concern for environmental or social consequences. Quade argues that while traffic may be analysed through a quantitative approach this is an inadequate model because it cannot realistically take into account political and social factors (Quade 1975, p.181).

Premier Steele Hall enthusiastically supported it and announced that many of the properties needed had already been purchased and $125 million was available for further purchases. Communities understood what the proposed freeways meant to them and there was a ferocious informed public debate. Hart, as Director of Planning, was supportive of the ideas underlying the proposals. Rolf Jensen, the Professor of Architecture at the University of Adelaide, became the leading opponent and argued that the freeways as proposed would be single biggest change in the 130 year history of the City and the enormous expenditure was not justified (Linn 2006, p.212). Stretton (1970, pp.167-172) analysed the impact on houses, schools and Park Lands in detail and argued the amount of land required for the freeways would destroy cohesive communities. Whitelock (1977, p.299) described the *MATS Report* as notorious as the freeways would have disembowelled much of the urban area. However, the editorial in *The Advertiser* when the *Report* was released was supportive of the proposals even though some 2,500 houses would be directly affected and a further 5,000 houses affected indirectly (*The Advertiser*, 12 August 1968, p.14).
The Steele Hall Government, pressed by the powerful motor vehicle and heavy construction industries, continued to defend the MATS proposals as rational. But public opposition grew in intensity and the debate became highly political. Sandercock (1975a, p.130) observes “Few things annoy and stir people into action as an eight-lane freeway pointed in their direction”. Versteeg & Hajer assert intense public participation occurs when people are threatened. They are less rational than should be assumed because they are unwilling or unable to gather all relevant information and judgements are then made on a range of factors (Versteeg & Hajer, 2010, p.165). As a key policy in the 1970 State election campaign, the Labor Party promised to revise the MATS proposals and produce a scheme which was financially possible, integrated with public transport, and where property destruction would be reduced to a minimum.

Premier Steele Hall honourably made an electoral distribution in 1969 which abolished the Playford weighting of the rural gerrymander but this was fatal for the conservative side of politics (Whitelock 1977, p.295). The Dunstan Labor government came to power in May 1970. Dunstan had promised in the election campaign he had comprehensive plans for change and that Adelaide would become the technological, design, social reform and artistic centre of Australia (Whitelock 1977, p.296). Dunstan’s view of South Australia was that it was a tolerant urbane society, enjoying a blend of natural and built environments with sensitivity to heritage issues (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.93). A ten year moratorium was imposed on freeway construction by the new State Government. While freeways were built in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Perth and Canberra they were not in Adelaide and thus the City again stood out as being different from the other capital cities.

It has been argued in this Section that the transport plan prepared for the metropolitan area which affected property rights without any public consultation was politically explosive, particularly in the City of Adelaide. This was the lesson learned by the State. In the next Section the influence of Town Clerk Bill Veale and City Engineer Hugh Bubb on the Park Lands and the traffic and parking policies of the City Council, which were also prepared without any consultation, will be examined.

2.3.5 POLICIES OF THE ADELAIDE CITY COUNCIL

In 1957 Town Clerk Veale had an extensive overseas trip to Canada, USA, UK and Europe. On his return Veale wrote very detailed reports, accompanied by numerous slides, on such topics as taxis, car parking traffic, street lighting, parks and gardens. However, Hart’s contributions to these reports,
referred to in Section 2.3.3, were not acknowledged by Veale. Veale took a personal interest in the heritage of Light’s Park Lands and Veale influenced the Council to fund an ambitious programme of improvements. Sir Arthur Rymill, a former Lord Mayor, said in Parliament (SAPD, Hansard, 13 July 1958 cited in Linn 2006, p.214):

There are some exciting ideas with regard to the Park Lands that the Town Clerk has brought back with him from overseas. It might be premature to give details of them at this stage but I think we will see some excellent developments of the Park Lands for the benefit of the people.

Eight schemes of beautification were proposed by Veale including a Par 3 golf course and restaurant, Rymill Park, Bonython Park, and a rose garden and restaurant in the South Park Lands subsequently named Veale Gardens. The cow paddocks of Adelaide, through the inspiration and influence of Veale and the financial support of the Council, were transformed into creative gardens (Linn 2006, p.217). The Park Lands were being beautified to ensure the City remained an attractive place and maintained its dominance as decentralisation was starting to occur with new suburban shopping centres opening at Marion and Kilkenny. In 1965 Veale retired from his position of Town Clerk and Playford was no longer Premier as he lost the election. Linn (2006, p.178) observes that when these two influential individuals left their respective positions in the City and the State, a change in community thinking about the nature of the City was beginning to occur.

The City Council policies in the 1960s about traffic and parking were engineering-dominated under the considerable influence of Veale and Bubb. Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 8:15, College Park, 16 April 2007) observes:

It is important to recognise the influence of Town Clerk Bill Veale. He had been the City Engineer before becoming Town Clerk. He was convinced of the need for another north-south road through the City, partly to relieve the pressure of growing traffic on King William Street in the centre of the City.Buying properties to provide such a new road became a key Council policy and this was followed vigorously by the then City Engineer, Hugh Bubb.

Gilbert Currie who worked for Bubb also contends Bubb was an individual of influence in Council affairs and Currie (Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 18:21, Dulwich, 24 April 2007) observes:

Hugh Bubb, the City Engineer, played a very important role in the planning of the city. He had a very strong personality and did not get on at all well with a number of elected members of the Council. Hugh had an overseas study trip and came back with lots of ideas about the City. He got himself designated as the City Engineer and Planner. I thought that Hugh was a really good engineer, but his views about planning were engineering-dominated.

Shelton (1986, p.208) states in relation to Veale and Bubb that by 1962, two narrow streets, Ackland Street and Tavistock Street, had been widened and joined across seven city blocks to form Frome Street, the first new major street imposed into Light’s Plan in the history of the City. Linn (2006,
p.152) asserts that Veale had first raised with the Council in 1947 the need for Frome Road (which then stopped at North Terrace) to be extended as a new road to South Terrace. From 1880 King William Street had run north-south through Victoria Square but in 1966 Bubb recommended to the Council that it should be closed and replaced by a one-way diamond. Shelton asserts it was a spatial engineering assault on the rectangular form and integrity of the heritage of Light’s layout. The Council was divided and the scheme was only passed on the casting vote of the Lord Mayor (James Irwin) who had been persuaded to vote in favour because of the extent of technical information provided by Bubb about traffic flows (Shelton 1986, p.208).

Bubb advised the Council, which saw itself as a separate and unique entity with the Park Lands acting like a moat, that the City would be affected by the MATS proposals (Linn 2006, p.209). The Council was in favour of the proposals because the freeways were aimed at maintaining and enhancing the commercial CBD even though there was no thought for the residents who would be affected. The Council’s own proposed new north-south road (as previously shown in Figure 15) was not actually part of the MATS Plan (as previously shown in Figure 19) but it was endorsed in the MATS Report with a minor variation at the eastern end of North Adelaide (Le Fevre Terrace would be used instead of Margaret Street as described). The plan was to take the new road from Main North Road through the Park Lands, down a widened Margaret Street with an overpass across Melbourne Street, straightening it to align with the existing Frome Road to North Terrace which would then go all the way to South Terrace and link up with Glen Osmond Road. Veale had written to all the owners in Margaret Street, North Adelaide in July 1956 advising them the Council had resolved to realign Margaret Street so that it could be widened.55 The new road made sense from a traffic point of view as it would keep through traffic out of the CBD and allow traffic with a destination in the centre to filter into the west off the new road. The Council continued purchasing properties for Frome Road and this became a contentious issue, particularly when Hugh Stretton became involved.

Currie (Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 26:40, Dulwich, 24 April 2007) recalls Stretton going to see Bubb and observes:

Hugh Stretton came to the Department and had a meeting with Hugh Bubb. I gather they had a fundamental disagreement because they could be heard well away from Bubb’s office. In particular, Stretton was very concerned about the loss of small, old houses with housed the City’s lower paid workers. I really think that this meeting between Hugh Stretton and Hugh Bubb was a critical turning point in the planning of the City.

55 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File No.391A.
Stretton recalls the reason he went to see Bubb was the Council had begun acquiring residential properties in and around Margaret Street very near to Stretton’s backyard and he wanted to find out why. Stretton (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 10:17, North Adelaide, 11 April 2007) states:

I went to see Mr. Bubb and during the meeting Mr. Bubb had held his forearm over a plan on his desk and used phrases such as ‘big things were underway’ and ‘drastic measures were needed’. When I was leaving Mr. Bubb got up and I saw the plan and realised that as well as in North Adelaide, properties all the way along Frome Road were to be acquired. These properties were mainly small, working class cottages and this made me very angry.

It is asserted this meeting was important because Stretton then became concerned about the Council’s policies and Bubb’s influence in the City. Some elected members of the Council, particularly Hayes, Bowen, Roche and Chappel, also started questioning Bubb’s engineering approach to planning the City, especially his justification for the new Frome Road. Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 /58:68, College Park, 16 April 2007) asserts:

Mr. Bubb had no aesthetic sense, no concern for the environment and was completely unsympathetic to the heritage of Colonel Light’s Plan for the City. In my view the City did not need an alternative to King William Street, there should be a ring route outside the Park Lands and the Terraces fulfilled the role of an inner ring route.

Chappel (Chappel, John, ohi 2 / 26:28, Kent Town, 13 April 2007) was also critical of Bubb’s approach and observes:

Hugh Bubb was a conventional engineer and more concerned about cars and roads than anything else. The Council had sent him on an overseas tour (mainly to Scandinavia and North America) and he had come back convinced of the need for the new north-south road and organized the compulsory acquisition of properties to complete Frome Road.

A view from outside the Council about Bubb’s plans was expressed by architect Newell Platten who was to become a State member of the City of Adelaide Development Committee. Platten (Platten, Newell, ohi 7 / 13:15, Adelaide, 7 April 2000) contends:

Hugh Bubb, the City Engineer, seemed to favour the ‘Russian’ model of long straight roads with cars going everywhere and high-rise apartment buildings being slotted between the roads. He clearly did not mind if the old houses disappeared.

While Bubb came back from his overseas trip convinced of the need for freeways and car parks to support the economic base of the City, he was also concerned at the decay of central city areas. He considered that large scale residential developments within the City were not only desirable but essential in order to maintain the economic viability of the central area and to prevent the growth of an extensive amount of land being under used. Frank Madigan was an engineer (in Bubb’s Department) who was studying part-time for a Master’s Degree in Town Planning at the University of Adelaide. Madigan, in his thesis (Madigan 1972, p.45), came to the conclusion that the future requirement for
land in South Adelaide for a “Central Business Zone” was excessive and should be reduced. A considerable amount of land could be put to more effective use as higher density living but there were barriers such as high Council rates, high water and sewer rates, high land tax and low rents (Madigan 1972, p.64). A study area of Hutt Street / Halifax Street / East Terrace / South Terrace (Figure 23) was chosen by Madigan for a comprehensive redevelopment scheme which would, in his opinion, make more effective use of the area.

Such a scheme could provide a solution to the problem presented by the large numbers of substandard houses on small allotments as rebuilding was not permitted. A minimum size residential lot size of 3960 square feet (368 square metres) had been introduced in the Building Act, 1923. The large houses in the area had been converted from residential use to consulting rooms and institutional purposes.

Figure 23 - Madigan’s study area and Bubb’s area for high rise housing
Source: Prepared by the researcher with base map provided by the Adelaide City Council

Madigan was also of the view that the secondary street system was wasteful of land. This had resulted from modifications to Light’s grid street pattern because Light’s spacing was too great for allotments of convenient back-to-back size. Madigan (1972, p.92) argued that East Terrace and
South Terrace could be closed within the study area and that a comprehensive redevelopment plan of high density living could be achieved. This would have the advantages of convenience to work, the amenity of the Park Lands, and a more effective use of government services. Horner (1978) asserts that Bubb, who had seen massive redevelopments in city centres in Europe, drew heavily on Madigan’s work and set about preparing a comprehensive residential redevelopment plan for the whole of the south-east area of the City. Bubb choose the new Frome Street as the western boundary and the scheme went all the way to East Terrace as also shown in Figure 23.

The proposed redevelopment would provide for a population of 18,000. The physical form of eleven tower blocks epitomised the comprehensive schemes of Le Corbusier with the minor roads eliminated. East Terrace would be closed and reverted to Park Lands as it was not essential for other than internal traffic. The Council would provide the car parking in multi-storey garages and would own and maintain the open space between the high rise buildings. The plans and a model were prepared administratively for an exhibition but were never given to Council members (Horner 1978, p.126).

Currie (Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 26:40, Dulwich, 24 April 2007) had a critical view of Bubb’s scheme:

Another of Hugh Bubb’s grandiose ideas was to have high rise residential development to the east of Frome Street covering the whole of the south-east corner. Three officers in the City Engineer’s Department worked on this – Brian Turner who was a valuer and Barry Matthews and Robin Hodgkinson who were both architects. This was really a crazy scheme with no chance of getting through the Council. Hugh Bubb eventually ordered that all copies of the drawings and printed report be destroyed.

There was a change in character of the Adelaide City Council in the late 1960s and the establishment lost its influence to a new group of hard headed, often self-made, businessmen including Bill Hayes. There was an acrimonious Lord Mayoral election in 1970 when Hayes ran against the establishment candidate Robert Porter and lost. Clampett (Clampett, Bob, ohi 9 / 22:27, Mount Barker, 30 April 2007) recalls his relationship with Hayes:

I had been very good friends with Bill Hayes and we were Gawler Ward Councillors together. In those days membership of the Liberal Party was important and you had to win pre-selection to run as a Councillor. However, when Bill Hayes decided to run against Porter for the Lord Mayoralty in 1970, I told Bill I could not support him as I was already committed to Porter. But if Bill ran again in the following year then I would support him. It turned out that Bill lost to Porter by only 28 votes, and the following year Bill was elected unopposed to the position of Lord Mayor.

When Hayes became Lord Mayor in 1971 a reformist Council took control of the Town Hall. Horner (1978, p.126) asserts that the plans for high rise residential development were placed under lock-and-key and ultimately destroyed by Bubb when Hayes became Lord Mayor. There is no record of these
residential plans in the Adelaide City Archives. Thirteen of the 19 members of Council were from the Adelaide establishment in 1966. After the 1971 election this was reduced to seven members out of the 19 and Bubb recognised the change in the political make up of the Council and that he was unlikely to be able to exercise the degree of influence he had previously enjoyed.

Benko & Lloyd (1949, pp.21-23) argued for the ideas of the vertical garden city of Le Corbusier to be applied in Adelaide with buildings some 10 to 20 storeys tall being surrounded by parks. The ground floors would be kept open and free from obstruction except for structural columns, glass wind breaks and entrances. While Benko & Lloyd merely intended to illustrate how the ideas of the Modern Movement could be applied to Adelaide, they articulated the approach to city planning that would be pursued by Bubb some years later. In Planning Report No.10 of July 1969 Bubb proposed a scheme to the Council for the redevelopment of the central area to be known as Stock Exchange Plaza. The scheme involved the clearance of two acres (0.81 hectares) between Pirie and Grenfell Streets and the construction of an open plaza at street level for the free circulation of pedestrians (Figure 24).

NOTE: This figure is included on page 153 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 24 - Proposed Stock Exchange Plaza
Source: City of Adelaide Planning Report No. 10, July 1969
Rising out of the plaza would be two prestige office towers to house existing uses, including a replacement for the historic Stock Exchange, and with some capacity for expansion. Bubb proposed an underground pedestrian system with shopping (as he had seen in Montreal) from the Central Market to Rundle Street (which was to become a Mall). As the first stage of comprehensive redevelopment of the central area the Stock Exchange Plaza would provide a crucial link for this underground pedestrian scheme.

Peter Ward (Premier Dunstan’s Chief of Staff from May 1970) in particular was very opposed to the plans for the Stock Exchange Plaza and the departure from the City’s existing fabric of buildings to the street alignment (P Ward 2007, pers. comm., 27 April). Sybella Blencowe has described the State’s concerns about the influence Bubb was having on the heritage and the urban design of the City. Blencowe (Blencowe, Sybella, ohi 21 / 34:37, Adelaide, 15 November 2007) advises:

Hugh Bubb was another factor in the Government’s concern about the City. He was known as ‘The Montreal Man’ because of his plan to provide an underground pedestrian network from the Central Market through the Stock Exchange Plaza to Rundle Street and build a freeway along the eastern side of the City.

Within the Council administration this proposed pedestrian link was known as “Bubb’s rabbit warren” (D Whittington 2007, pers. comm., 25 May). Currie (Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 22:26, Dulwich, 24 April 2007) also describes this scheme:

One scheme of Bubb’s was to create a plaza between Grenfell and Pirie Streets with two new office towers and an underground link to Rundle Street and the Central Market. Bubb had been very impressed with the underground pedestrian network in Montreal but failed to appreciate the influence of the weather and it was never going to work in Adelaide. Indeed, 55 Grenfell Street (‘The Black Stump’) with its sunken forecourt was the only part of the scheme ever built.

Shelton (1986) asserts the proposals from Bubb were based on the Modern Movement’s principles of space and form but were in significant conflict with the heritage of Adelaide’s spatial structure. The buildings were to stand in open landscaped space and the major streets of Light’s Plan were irrelevant. The smaller streets were to be either widened or eliminated. The two identical perfectly square free-standing towers of the Stock Exchange Plaza were designed to promote the centre in its own right but in isolation from the patterns around it. The scheme was only partially realised when the first tower was completed in 1974. It dominated the City skyline and established its own ground level with a sunken basement. The historic French Gothic Stock Exchange was saved and so the second tower was never built. It is of note that the Adelaide City Council has recently (2008) approved a

56 R W (Dick) Whittington was the Council’s Commercial Manager during the early 1970s.
partial filling-in of the basement and two new low rise buildings in Grenfell Street in front of the tower. These re-established the building alignment to the street to be consistent with Light’s heritage of City allotments instead of there being an open plaza.

While the Council was pursuing its transport, commercial and residential schemes, in terms of governance it was also working cooperatively with the State to provide a Festival Hall in the City. The first Adelaide Festival of the Arts was held in 1960 with a wide variety of artistic delights (Linn 2006, p.195). The idea of a Festival Hall was instigated by some of Adelaide’s conservative but far-sighted citizens. John Bishop, the Professor of Music at the University of Adelaide and Dumas, the editor of *The Advertiser* had an interest in the Arts. They became allies and friends in the search for a Festival Hall which they saw as pivotal in the evolution and maturation of the Arts in the City. James Irwin, who was an architect and a Councillor, looked at facilities for the Arts on an overseas trip to London, Istanbul, Paris, Rome and Milan. Lord Mayor Hargrave organised a meeting of influential individuals from The Adelaide Club to support a proposal to the State (ibid, p.193). Campbell asserts Playford was not noted for his artistic inclinations and initially rejected the request but the Adelaide establishment wore him down and eventually he promised funds of £800,000 if the City Council provided £100,000 and a further £100,000 was raised by public subscription (Campbell 1998, p.8).

The *Festival Hall (City of Adelaide) Act, 1964* provided for the building and financing of the project. By this time the Council had decided on a site in North Adelaide and purchased properties at Montefiore Hill including “Carclew” owned by the Bonython family. Irwin had become Lord Mayor and he briefed the new Labor Premier Frank Walsh after the 1965 election. The architects of the Festival Hall were the Adelaide firm of Hassell, McConnell and Partners. Site works were started in North Adelaide and some large homes, but not “Carclew”, were demolished. The appropriateness of the site, particularly in terms of traffic, started to become a political issue and demolition was halted. The Council started considering other options and when Steele Hall became Premier in April 1968 he formed a committee consisting of Lord Mayor Irwin, the Director of Planning (Hart), and the Director of Public Buildings (Dunn) to investigate the whole project. The committee came to the view the best site would be Elder Park to the north of Parliament House and Steele Hall then persuaded the Council and the Government of its merits. Dunstan, then Leader of the Opposition, while very supportive of the Arts was opposed to the site. However, when Dunstan became Premier in 1970 it was too late to change the site and he expanded the idea of a Hall into a Festival Centre with subsidiary venues. An Adelaide Festival Centre Trust was established by Dunstan to run the Centre rather than the ACC but,
given the City Council’s influence, two Trustees were nominated by the Council (Campbell 1998, p.21; Linn 2006, pp.196-206).

The story of the Festival Centre is a good example of City/State governance in Adelaide. Lord Mayor Hargrave, with support from The Adelaide Club, and then Lord Mayor Irwin influenced both sides of politics at the State level to achieve a project in the interests of the City, Government and the people of South Australia (Campbell 1998, p.11).

The initial influence of Veale, and then Bubb, on the City Council’s policies towards the Park Lands, traffic, parking and high-rise residential development has been reviewed in this Section. Bubb’s engineering approach began to be questioned by Stretton and some of the elected members of the Council as well as by residents of the City, particularly in North Adelaide and the south-eastern corner of South Adelaide. Residents’ groups formed to oppose Council policies arising from Bubb’s plans and this issue is examined in the next Section.

2.3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS AND THE RISE OF RESIDENTS ACTION GROUPS

After the seminal writings of Young & Willmott (1957) and Jacobs (1961) a considerable body of work emerged in the 1960s about growing community concerns with government schemes for urban improvement including freeways, the removal of decayed houses and their replacement with new housing in the form of high rise towers. These improvement schemes could be described as “Master Plans or end-state plans” which Eversley (1971, p.281) defines as finished articles based on the needs of an earlier time and pursued through programmes of considerable effort and investment.

Wingfield (1963), Davidoff (1965), Altshuler (1966), Chermayeff & Alexander (1966) and Arnstein (1969) discuss various aspects of why protests arose about the nature of the planning processes and the lack of any involvement by the people who would be affected by planning decisions taken in a political context. Ward (2004, p.123) comments the Skeffington Report published in Britain in 1969 endorsed the principle of public participation and reinforced calls for the dispersal of power within society so that decision-making would be more democratic.

Stretton (1978, p.203) is very critical of the design of cities through physical planning schemes alone because no thought was given in the outcomes to the economic and social effects on the community.
Further writings emerged in the 1970s with Gans (1972), Goodman (1972), Rowland (1973), Friedmann & Barclay (1974) and Simmie (1974) all addressing the role of planners and citizen conflict in the making of plans. Ward (2004, p.183) observes that while elaborate public participation exercises became an important feature of plan making in the 1970s, planners were seen as part of the problem as they had become an institutionalised bureaucracy dominated by architects and engineers. Whitfield (2006, p.199) claims public attention had been focussed on the destruction that lay behind the words “planning” and “redevelopment”. Whitfield (2006, p.184) also states that huge campaigns were mounted against freeways in London and observes that the Royal Institute of British Architects had unearthed a prophetic plea which had been published in 1869: “any means which could be devised to diminish vehicular traffic in the city would be more successful than endeavours to accommodate it.”

Gleeson & Low (2000, p.21) assert the systems approach to planning, which was popular in the 1970s, provided the illusion of a rational analysis of complex problems but failed to appreciate the inherent political or social values.

Davidoff (1965), Altshuler (1966), Chermayeff & Alexander (1966), Arnstein (1969), Friend & Jessop (1969), Colman (1971), Gans (1972), Goodman (1972), Pugh (1973), Rowland (1973), Simmie (1974), Pahl (1975), Forester (1981), Clavel (1986), Lemon (1993) and Douglass & Friedmann (1998), all address the lack of public participation in the planning process and its implications during the 1960s and 1970s in terms of power structures and how planners need to empower citizens to create the possibility of genuinely democratic decisions. Foucault (1980) looks at the relationship between power and knowledge and how political action was subsequently shaped at the local level while Flyvberg (1998) applies this relationship to planning and how power was exercised. Peel (1995, p.15) contends planning is always conducted in the face of power, planners take opportunities and seize the moment, working within and around structures of decision-making they do not control. Friedman (1981, p.162) asserts “in the face of power, justice and equality are hopes, and solidarity is a source of strength.”

Ward (2004, p.126) argues there was an improvement in research intelligence and analysis so that spatial patterns of land use were strategically integrated with transport and development and there was a clear break from the tradition of “master plans”. Diefendorf (2000, p.191) asserts that planners lost their attraction to freeways in central areas as residents mobilised against the destruction caused.
The situation in metropolitan Adelaide in relation to the proposals for freeways was discussed earlier in Section 2.3.4 of this Chapter. There was also an adverse reaction to proposals for high rise housing and comprehensive redevelopment schemes. The public had become sceptical and was critical of the social impact, particularly on families with children. In the eastern suburb of Hackney the State Planning Authority and St Peters Council proposed a comprehensive redevelopment scheme with the compulsory acquisition of 14 fourteen acres (11 hectares) of 19th century cottages, town houses and a caravan park housing some 250 people.

A Redevelopment Committee for the area engaged Rolf Jensen, Professor of Architecture at the University of Adelaide, to prepare a redevelopment plan. Jensen had opposed MATS as described earlier but he was an advocate of high rise residential development (Jensen, 1966). He proposed clearance of the whole site and a comprehensive development of tower blocks, partly by the SAHT and partly by the private sector. Some 1000 people would be housed by replacing the existing residents’ homes (Forster & McCaskill 2007, p.95).

Pugh (1973, p.110) provides an extensive history of the scheme in the context of the social action which occurred. The St Peters Residents’ Association was formed which questioned the physical orientation of the planners, arguing there was no social validity for the proposed high rise scheme. This brought into the open the benefits of gradual rehabilitation rather than comprehensive redevelopment. Premier Dunstan had originally supported the proposals but the public outcry was in his own seat which threatened his re-election. By 1972 Dunstan had changed his mind and so a political decision was made to abandon the scheme. However, the SAHT bought some properties for renovation as a result of the community action. In an address to the Royal Australian Planning Institute congress in Brisbane that year Dunstan placed an emphasis on communication and participation. He said: “Inner city redevelopment does not mean the wholesale tearing down of existing communities to simply replace them with an asphalt desert and high rise blocks of flats”.57

Peel (1995, p.28) argues that planners claimed the right to seize the making of urban space and turn it to rational and humane ends, to control the location of industry and commerce, and to assert public ownership and control against what they considered to be the chaos of private decisions. In North Adelaide Bubb proposed to clear a large part of the historic centre and replace it with a suburban style shopping centre and open lot car parking. North Adelaide was the home of some of the

---

57 Personal recollections of the researcher who was present at the conference and heard Dunstan speak.
establishment with wealthy, educated and articulate residents who had considerable influence. Faced with the threat of the MATS freeways and the Council’s proposal for Frome Street/Frome Road and a shopping complex in North Adelaide, the North Adelaide Society Inc. was formed in 1970. The Society became very powerful and resourceful and commissioned a study entitled *North Adelaide: survival of a heritage* (Hannaford & Pak-Poy, 1971) which was to become the basis for future planning decisions in North Adelaide. The Society started choosing candidates for the two Wards (Robe and MacDonnell) in North Adelaide for election to the Council. John Watson\(^{58}\) was the first such Councillor elected in 1972 and the Society began to exert considerable influence within the City Council to maintain the character of North Adelaide and the heritage of the City (Linn 2006, p.246).

In South Adelaide a group of highly educated young professionals formed the Adelaide Residents’ Association in 1972. The Society was not as successful with candidates for Council elections as the North Adelaide Society, primarily because of the extensive commercial vote in South Adelaide. However, they were able to make strong representations to Council members about the need to change Council’s traffic and parking policies and the demolition of houses. The community was questioning the ‘development at all costs’ mentality of the Council. The construction of tall buildings such as *The Advertiser* building in King William Street, the Napier building at the University of Adelaide and high rise apartments in North Adelaide were making impacts on the skyline not anticipated in the low rise City. Much of Adelaide’s charm lay in its old buildings and there was a need to value the past or the heritage of the City’s built form would disappear forever (Linn 2006, p.189).

This Section has examined the reasons for the rise of Residents’ groups in Adelaide and identified the beginnings of the political impact they were to have on the Adelaide City Council to change its policies about traffic, parking and high-rise development in order retain the heritage of the City.

### 2.3.7 SUMMARY

In this Chapter the issues of governance and the influence of individuals, in terms of the changes which occurred in the City and State from 1950 until 1972, have been reviewed. These changes occurred within the international context of freeway proposals and comprehensive redevelopment schemes to replace ‘slums’ with high rise residential developments. In Adelaide things were different

\(^{58}\) John Watson was to become Lord Mayor and Chairman of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission from 1981 to 1983.
and such proposals were decisively rejected by the community. The individual influence of Hugh Stretton in these issues was substantial. Soon after the MATS Report had been released in 1970 Stretton published his “Ideas for Australian Cities”. Sandercock (1975a, p.143) contends the book was a readable blend of polemic and treatise, emphasising the political nature of planning decisions and the social effects of their impacts. It was a timely counter to the technical planning solutions then being proposed. Stretton examined cities in terms of personalities, ideologies and the politics that framed them, rather than in technical terms. It was a powerful and persuasive book with a consistent theme of the impact of urban decision-making on the actual needs of the people affected – particularly the poor, the disadvantaged and the inarticulate. Further, Sandercock asserts that Adelaide was receptive to change because of the imaginative and respectable leadership of Stretton who was not only an academic and author but an activist in terms of being a founding member of the North Adelaide Society Inc., a member of the City of Adelaide Development Committee and Deputy Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust. Linn (2006 p.246) asserts that Stretton was a most influential person because he was trusted by Premier Dunstan and Lord Mayor Hayes. Soon after the election of the Dunstan Government in 1970 there was a radical shift in direction and emphasis in urban planning in South Australia – particularly in the City where there was an election of a reformist Lord Mayor and Council in 1971. The Dunstan Government was sensitive to cultural matters, urban renewal and social reform (Parkin & Patience, 1981). There was a feeling in the Council and the State that unless something was done to stop the growing tide of demolition and ad hoc development, the City would be carved up, old buildings destroyed and residential areas in South Adelaide vacated. Sandercock (1975a, p. 144) asserts the City has always had its dominating personalities who have exercised strong influence upon its development and much of what is good about planning in Adelaide is the result of a few individuals being in positions of power and influence.

As a result of the issues outlined in this Chapter there was an unusual degree of cooperation between the City and the State, through the Lord Mayor and the Premier, about the future governance of the City. Through their influence an innovative and different system of planning and development control was introduced for the City. This will be examined and analysed in detail in Part Three of this thesis.
PART THREE

The politics of strategic and statutory planning in the City of Adelaide from 1972 until 1993
CHAPTER 3.1

The period of Interim Development Control from October 1972 until February 1977; governance, influence, heritage and integration

Dunstan and Hayes - City of Adelaide Development Committee - City of Adelaide Planning Study - Residential renewal - City/State negotiations - City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 - Principles of Development Control - City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter covers the period of Interim Development Control (IDC) from October 1972 until February 1977 and specifically addresses a core research question:

What were the important factors in the introduction of Interim Development Control for the City in October 1972?

In light of the governance framework which was examined in Chapter 1.4, I will argue that there was an unusual degree of cooperation between the Council of the City of Adelaide (ACC) and the State Government of South Australia (State) to set a new direction for the City of Adelaide (City) with the establishment of a joint City/State body, the City of Adelaide Development Committee (CADC), which provided an innovative and different form of Interim Development Control. I will argue that George Clarke influenced the planning of the City through the important City of Adelaide Planning Study, 1974. Negotiations between the ACC and State leading to the adoption of the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 and separate legislation for the City, the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 are examined and analysed in terms of the influence of key individuals. The significance of this was the separation of policy from development control but their integration in a comprehensive planning system.

3.1.2 THE INFLUENCE OF PREMIER DUNSTAN AND LORD MAYOR HAYES

In this Section I will argue that the reformist Premier Dunstan and reformist Lord Mayor Hayes were individuals of influence who together brought about an innovative and different form of governance for planning the City through a joint City/State body. As described in Chapter 2.3 the ACC policies of traffic planning, car parking and urban design and development were of concern to Dunstan and the State. Patience & Pugh (1984, p.94) assert that the City presented a particular problem for a reformist State government. The ACC, a venerable institution comprising representatives of both the
old establishment and the newer commercial elite, presided over a City losing residents as commerce expanded. Residences in South Adelaide were condemned, razed, and the sites bituminised for car parks or new roadways. This was not Dunstan’s view of Adelaide as a social-democratic urbane city with cultural facilities, pedestrian areas, high-density mixed land uses, lively street life and outdoor cafes (Patience & Pugh 1984, p.95).

The statutory zoning of the whole of South Adelaide as Central Business Zone in the State’s *Metropolitan Development Plan, 1962*, which was contributing to the loss of residents from the City, and the transportation proposals in the MATS report, worried Hayes and the ACC. Besides Dunstan and Hayes there were a number of other individuals who exerted influence, to varying degrees, in the planning of the City through the period of IDC from October 1972 until February 1977. These individuals and their positions are shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE 2 – Individuals of influence 1972 - 1977</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Dunstan+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Stretton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Bakewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell Platten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Brine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hayes+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Clampett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bowen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chappel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Clarke+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Hignett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Hains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Lloyd-Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Currie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Horner+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Hudson+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sybella Daunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Arland+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Bubb+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Wagner,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Llewellyn-Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Signifies deceased

Linn (2006, p.246) states that when Hayes became Lord Mayor he was convinced that the administration, mainly the City Engineer Hugh Bubb and to a lesser extent the Town Clerk, Russell Arland, had far too much influence and this had led to ill-considered and undesirable decisions by the
Council about the development of the City. Hayes made it clear to Arland that he viewed the ACC as a Board of Directors with himself as Chairman. It would be the elected members, not the administration, which would take the initiative in the future and set the agenda. Hayes was supported in this view by Councillors Bowen, Roche and Chappel and their recollections are pertinent about Hayes’ influence and his role with Dunstan. Real Estate Agent Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3/ 44:47, College Park, 16 April 2007) states:

With the election of Bill Hayes as Lord Mayor there was a ‘changing of the guard’ on the Council and supported by John Roche (with his development experience), John Chappel (an architect) and me, Hayes set about changing the direction of the city, particularly the traffic and parking policies of Bubb.

Developer Roche (Roche, John, ohi 4/18:19, North Adelaide, 17 April, 2007) expresses the view:

Don Dunstan had a personal interest in the City and Lord Mayor Hayes started discussions with the Premier about the City and where it was headed.

Architect Chappel (Chappel, John, ohi 2/ 9:10, Kent Town, 13 April 2007) explains his own involvement:

I was not happy with the direction the City was taking in the late 1960s and so I ran as a Councillor and got elected when Bill Hayes became Lord Mayor. I like to think I was one of the players who brought about a change.

Wine Merchant Bob Clampett (Clampett, Bob, ohi 9 / 27:31, Mount Barker, 30 April 2007) who followed Hayes as Lord Mayor provides further insight about Hayes and Dunstan:

Bill Hayes was a very able businessman but he developed an extraordinary relationship with the Labor Premier Don Dunstan. I considered that Bill only ever had one thought on his mind and that was, what was in the best interests of the City of Adelaide. If this course of action happened to upset Town Clerk Arland or City Engineer Bubb, that was not Bill’s problem.

Bob Bakewell was the Commissioner of the Public Service Board before becoming Head of the Premier’s Department. Bakewell considers Hayes was extremely concerned about what changes a radical Labor Government under Dunstan might make. Hayes realised Dunstan was probably going to be in power for some time and this made the ACC vulnerable. Newell Platten, who was the Chief Architect and Planner of the SAHT, agrees Dunstan was concerned about the ACC and what was happening in the City. There was a real fear, particularly by former Lord Mayors who were members of The Adelaide Club that the institution of the ACC which had been in place since 1840 was at risk.
Hugh Stretton recalls (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 26:31, North Adelaide, 11 April 2007) in relation to Hayes and the ACC:

I met Bill Hayes at residents’ meetings in North Adelaide which were being organised to protest about the City’s plans and acquisition of residential properties for the Frome Road widening. There was a concern for the way the City was heading and there was a need for a new approach.

Bubb recognised there needed to be a different approach to planning the City and he decided late in 1971 that the ACC should prepare a Supplementary Development Plan under the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 1966. Bubb began to assemble an internal team of people with different skills to undertake this planning study. At that stage he only had Gilbert Currie and Frank Madigan who were both engineers, and he was looking for planning and urban design skills. Geoff Wagner, a planner, and David Horner, an architect were appointed to the two positions.59 Wagner (Wagner, Geoff, ohi 19 / 16:18, Burnside, 7 November 2007) recalls:

Events started to change quickly soon after we were employed and Lord Mayor Hayes was manoeuvring behind the scenes to take a quite different approach.

In September 1971 Hayes approached city and regional planning Professor Denis Winston of Sydney and planner and landscape architect Peter Harrison of Canberra to act as advisors to the ACC on the steps to be taken in the preparation of a Supplementary Development Plan (SDP).60 The involvement of Winston and Harrison is further described in Appendix 11. It was indicative of Hayes’ view of the administration that he did not seek their advice on this matter. Hayes informed Dunstan in November that Winston and Harrison had been engaged to advise the Council on an appropriate form of IDC and the steps to take in the preparation of a SDP. He also observed City Engineer Bubb had been the recipient of criticism both within and outside the Council. Accordingly, the structure of Bubb’s department was going to be reviewed. Hayes acknowledged the concerns Dunstan had raised about the large number of private and public open lot car parks but observed they were serving a useful short term purpose and would be readily available for more appropriate development at a later date.61

Linn (2006, pp.243-254) asserts the need for residential renewal and an awareness of the City’s heritage had become major issues for Hayes and Dunstan; they agreed that something had to be done or Adelaide would have a dead heart. The proposed destruction of the ANZ Bank in King William Street and its replacement with a high-rise office building (by the Mainline Corporation)

59 See Minutes of the meeting of the ACC 29 November 1971, p.276.
60 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 671/A.
61 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 671/B.
became a turning point in the City for the ACC and the State. The building was one of the better nineteenth century architectural designs by Edmund Wright. The National Trust was leading community action to save the building from demolition. Currie (Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 48:51, Dulwich, 24 April 2007) recalls Dunstan’s influence on heritage issues:

An important issue was the proposed demolition of Edmund Wright House and the public protests that followed. Dunstan took a personal interest in this and the State stepped in to prevent the demolition, picking up on the general disquiet in the community about development proposals.

Dunstan (1981, p.181) states that his government bought the Bank to prevent demolition and secure its future. It was renamed ‘Edmund Wright House’ and became the Register for Births, Deaths and Marriages with the Arts Development Branch on the top floor. Dunstan often intervened directly in developments in the City; he persuaded Cabinet to return Ayers House to the National Trust rather than developing it as a chest clinic (ibid, p.184).

Linn (2006, pp.238–243) argues Dunstan was also influential in the creation of Rundle Mall. In November 1972 he wrote to the Council requesting that the establishment of a Mall in Rundle Street be investigated. A special committee was formed consisting of two members of the SA Retail Traders Association, two members of Council and two appointed by the Premier. Progress was slow and Clampett (Clampett, Bob, ohi 9 / 17:19, Mount Barker, 30 April 2007) recalls the Government threatened to put 44 gallon drums at each end of the street unless the Council acted. In June 1974 the committee endorsed preliminary plans and in February 1975 architect Ian Hannaford was engaged to prepare the detailed design. Rundle Mall was officially opened by Dunstan on 1 September 1976 and, in another South Australian first, it was unique amongst the Australian capital cities for the conversion of a street into a pedestrian shopping area (also see Appendix 22).

Through its influence in the Legislative Council, as described in Chapter 2.3, the ACC was not covered by the Planning and Development Act, 1967 and this left the Council without development control powers. Early in 1972 the ACC sought IDC powers from the State (Patience & Pugh 1984, p.102). Hayes advised the Council in June 1972 62 that control of development in the City during the preparation of a SDP had been carefully examined and discussed with Dunstan. Special legislation would be the enacted as a comprehensive new direction was needed. Thus the issue was one of

62 See Minutes of the Meeting of the ACC 16 June 1972, p.661.
governance between the ACC and State to bring this about. Chappel (Chappel, John, ohi 2 / 12:14, Kent Town, 13 April 2007) contends:

The City was always different from the rest of the State, and the Council was not prepared to be under the control of the State Planning Authority.

Stretton (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 35:36, North Adelaide, 11 April 2007) observes:

I contributed to the idea of a joint City/State body – the State Government did not want the City running things allowing businesses to go unchecked, and the City did not want to hand over its powers to the State.

Hart acknowledges the lack of any involvement by the State Planning Authority (Hart, Stuart, ohi 5 / 21:26, Springfield, 18 April, 2007):

Interim Development Control powers were well established by 1972. I was not aware of the discussions between Dunstan and Hayes which led to the separate legislation for the City but I was aware Hugh Stretton had the ear of Dunstan and that he was very influential. There was some criticism of the SPA by the Premier and he appeared to be losing faith in the Authority.

Bakewell (Bakewell, Bob, ohi 11 / 13:15, Adelaide, 14 June 2007) provides background to what actually happened:

It would be better if the City Council itself came up with some ideas. Bill Hayes and John Roche were certainly involved in these discussions. However, the thinking was that the idea of a joint City/State body should appear as a Government initiative. This suited Premier Dunstan as he wanted to have the kudos.

Blencowe (Blencowe, Sybella, ohi 21 / 29:33, Adelaide, 15 November 2007) argues that Hugh Stretton had been an influence on Dunstan who decided the City needed a higher strategic focus than could be delivered by the existing State system:

The decision to establish the CADC was primarily to take the decision-making role away from both the Council and the State Planning Authority. This was a radical and significant intervention. If Premier Dunstan, with the cooperation of key members of the Council, had not intervened personally, Adelaide would have been a very different place today.

Whitelock (1977, p.296) observes that even South Australian Liberals could feel a sense of pride in a Premier who was so eloquently proud of Adelaide and while Dunstan was ‘centre right’ on economics and ‘centre left’ on social reform, he was after all a scion of the establishment: St Peter’s College and the University of Adelaide. Mike Rann (Premier of South Australia from 2002 and formerly Dunstan’s Media Advisor) contends that Dunstan was the nation’s most reformist Premier. He had a visionary approach to the environment, the arts, social policy and law reform. Dunstan was the most potent threat to the old citadels of privilege and justice but he led South Australia out of a dull conservatism. Under Dunstan, South Australia was the ideal test bed for new ideas because it was the place where
the future happened first (M Rann 2009, pers. comm., 6 February). Dunstan was a charismatic and powerful person who could talk to all levels of people and get things done (Platten, Newell, ohi 10 / 55:56, Adelaide, 7 May 2007). Patience & Pugh (1984, p.112) argue the Dunstan government, and the personal involvement of the Premier himself was unmistakeable, brought about urban policies which were imaginative, humane and innovative with the City acquiring an urbane sensitivity. The program of policy-making and informed public debate was unprecedented in Australian cities and the joint ACC/State approach to planning the City of Adelaide was different to anything else in Australia at the time.

In this Section it has been argued Dunstan and Hayes had concerns about the City and were influential in bringing about a new approach to its governance and planning. This was through the introduction of special legislation for a joint City/State body – the City of Adelaide Development Committee (CADC) - which will be examined in the next Section.

3.1.3 LEGISLATION FOR THE CITY OF ADELAIDE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

In this Section the background to the special legislation for the City is examined. In late 1971 Town Clerk Arland indicated to John Williams (Chief Clerk in the Town Clerk’s Department) the Dunstan Labor Government was becoming very interested in what the ACC was doing. Dunstan had established a policy unit in his Department which considered various issues, problems and proposals and was expected to provide answers. Arland advised something similar was being considered for the City and it was likely that Williams would become involved in this. Williams (Williams, John, ohi 7 / 20:25, Leabrook, 20 April 2007) provides insight about his appointment as Secretary of the CADC:

I recall very clearly that on 25 July 1972 I was called into the Town Clerk’s room. The Town Clerk advised me a new body was being formed – the City of Adelaide Development Committee – and that I was going to be seconded to be its Secretary. The first meeting was to be at 7.45am the next day, July 26 1972. Lord Mayor Hayes had requested the Town Clerk to provide a secretary to this new body and that it be me.

It appeared the Premier had advised the Lord Mayor a few weeks earlier that the CADC was to be appointed through an amendment to the Planning and Development Act, 1966 but Hayes had not advised Arland. The CADC would consist of four government representatives and three Council representatives with the Lord Mayor as Chairman. Neither Arland nor Bubb had been involved in formation of a ‘policy’ body for the City. Patience & Pugh (1984, p.102) argue that the direct involvement of Dunstan was evident in forming the CADC.
In the House of Assembly on 17 August 1972 the Deputy Premier (Des Corcoran) in the second reading of a Bill for an Act to amend the Planning and Development Act, 1966 (SA Parliamentary Debates, Hansard, pp.883-887) referred to the heritage of the City and the new committee. Corcoran said:

The purpose of this Bill is to establish a committee and invest it with powers to control development in the City of Adelaide. The visionary insight of Colonel Light, the excellence of his ideas, and the competence with which he brought them into execution established a sound basis for the future development of the City.

Corcoran went on to argue that the State could not afford to allow the City, which was excellent in its original conception and design, to become an aesthetic wasteland of discordant architecture in which the civilised values of design and beauty are stifled. He noted that the ACC had recognised the dangers inherent in the trends in the development of the City and it intended to engage consultants to advise it on future development. However, there needed to be interim planning controls otherwise the efforts of the ACC would be frustrated.

In the Bill a committee of seven members was proposed. Of these the State would nominate four, and the Council three including the Lord Mayor, for the time being, as the Chairman of the committee. The State considered this would provide adequate representation for the ACC. Corcoran explained the powers of the committee would be two-fold. First, the committee would be empowered to make planning directives to establish the broader principles within which development in the City would proceed. Second, the committee would be empowered to consider proposed building work within the City and could take into account the aesthetic and sociological impacts of the proposal. All building work would require the approval of the committee.

There was considerable debate on the second reading of the Bill. The Labor Member for Torrens (Coumbe) supported the Bill because he considered it served a useful purpose. The committee would be innovative and different because it would consist of officers appointed by the State and members appointed by the ACC. Coumbe spoke on the heritage of Light’s plan and the special governance arrangements between the State and the ACC:

The Bill is unique because it affects the capital city and Adelaide is the oldest municipality in Australia. Adelaide is the finest example of town planning in Australia and the greatest credit should go to Colonel Light for his vision in planning the City. He did his work in the face of severe criticism, especially by the first Governor of the State, Captain Hindmarsh. The proposal is probably one of the few occasions on which the Government and City Council have got together.
However, the Liberal Country League Members for Alexandra (Brookman) and Mitcham (Millhouse) opposed the Bill. Brookman expressed concern at the implications for the ACC:

I cannot understand how the City Council should be subjugated to a committee which has little or no relationship to its ratepayers and which can take over the affairs of the City Council in almost every significant way.

Millhouse reflected on the Premier's criticism of the SPA and stated:

The Premier said these measures are to make the City the most effective urban environment. He has criticised the State Planning Authority and said it has not worked as he intended it to work.

Dunstan gave the address in reply to the Bill. He summarised the State's position about the governance of planning the City as:

This measure will provide a planning process which will give real teeth to a responsible authority to ensure we get the kind of City I believe the vast majority of the citizens of this State want to see.

The House of Assembly then met in Committee, the usual protocol, to consider the Bill in detail where Coumbe moved an amendment that:

The Committee shall consist of the following members:-
(a) the Lord Mayor for the time being of the Council who shall be Chairman of the Committee ex officio; and
(b) six other members appointed by the Governor of whom three shall be persons nominated by the Council.

Dunstan accepted the amendment which was then carried and the Bill with amendment was reported back to the House of Assembly where it was passed. Hayes had used his influence to change the composition of the Committee so that instead of the State having a 4:3 majority as originally proposed, in effect the ACC had a 4:3 majority (the Lord Mayor plus three members). This change, as it was supported by the ACC, ensured the passage of the Bill through the Legislative Council. The joint CADC could then be established under a new Part VA of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1972.

Bennett (1976, p.128) contends Part VA of the Act provided another example of the City having a separate status as this Part was quite different from the rest of the Act. It provided for the CADC to administer IDC while a planning study was carried out and a Supplementary Development Plan prepared. Daunt (1976, p.48) observes the CADC’s power to make Planning Directives under the Act

63 The full text of Dunstan's address in reply gives the detail of the State's position and is included as Appendix 12.
to regulate a broad range of issues affecting development in the City resembled the British Town and Country Development Orders.

Bakewell (Bakewell, Bob, ohi 11 / 24:26, Adelaide, 14 June 2007) provides some insight into the composition of the CADC:

Common sense dictated that the Committee of three Government and three Council members with the Lord Mayor of the day as Chairman, was a reasonable size. The Upper House (Legislative Council) was placated as technically the Council had the numbers four to three.

In the South Australian Government Gazette on 19 October 1972 (p.1929) the following six appointments to the CADC were made pursuant to the provisions of the Act, the Lord Mayor being the *ex officio* Chairman:

- **Nominated by the Council:**
  - Councillor James Vincent Seaton Bowen
  - Councillor John Singleton Chappel
  - Councillor John Justin Roche

- **Other Members:**
  - Robert David Eavestaff Bakewell
  - Hugh Stretton
  - Newell James Platten

Williams recalls that at the first formal meeting of the CADC it became clear that the Committee had already met three times informally in the Lord Mayor’s Room. This explained why Bakewell, Stretton and Platten had been seen outside the Lord Mayor’s Room in preceding weeks but there was no record of any such meetings in the daily engagement sheets of the Lord Mayor.

Hayes was quoted by Garth Rawlins in the News (30 November 1972, p.8) as saying the CADC was going to arrest the decline in the City’s population and bring about residential growth. Maxwell Whiting wrote in The Advertiser (9 December 1972, p.5) that the legislation had evolved after talks between the Premier and Lord Mayor about the shortcomings of the Planning and Development Act as it applied to the City; Adelaide should be a City where people could live as well as work.⁶⁴

In this Section the background to the legislation for a new approach to planning the City through an innovative joint body, the CADC, has been examined. Dunstan and Hayes had agreed on a governance arrangement but the actual composition of the Committee was changed in Parliament through Hayes’ influence. The influential individual members appointed to the CADC will be described in the next Section.

---

⁶⁴ Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s Files (C.15) Accession No.352, File 671/A.
In this Section the appointments of the Council and State members to the new joint body will be examined. Hayes was *ex officio* Chairman of the CADC from its formation in October 1972 until July 1973 when Bob Clampett succeeded him. Clampett reflects on why Bowen, Roche and Chappel were appointed to the CADC (Clampett, Bob, ohi 9 / 9:12, Mount Barker, 30 April 2007):

> The Council was happy with Jim Bowen, John Roche and John Chappel being the members on the CADC because they were the only ones who knew anything about development. That was the Council’s attitude at the time.

Williams (Secretary of the CADC) (Williams, John, ohi 7 / 43:45, Leabrook, 20 April 2007) also provides advice about the ACC members appointed to the CADC:

> The three powerful members of the Council were Councillors Bowen, Roche and Chappel. They really stood out from the other elected members and it was natural that they should represent the Council on the CADC.

These three Councillors remained as the ACC nominees on the CADC throughout the period of Interim Development Control administered by the Committee from October 1972 until February 1977. Their interests and expertise were in real estate, development and architecture and they exercised considerable influence on the planning and development of the City (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 70:74, College Park, 16 April 2007; Roche, John, ohi 4 / 8:12, North Adelaide, 17 April; Chappel, John, ohi 2 / 54:56, Kent Town, 13 April 2007).

The three State members appointed to the CADC were Bakewell (then the Head of the Premier’s Department), Stretton (academic, author and activist in North Adelaide) and Platten (Chief architect and planner of the SAHT). Stretton was on leave overseas during 1973 and the State appointed John Brine (Reader in Town Planning at the University of Adelaide) as his deputy. They all have recollections about their membership of the CADC and what influences were brought to bear in their respective appointments. Bakewell remembers a discussion with Dunstan and Peter Ward (Dunstan’s Chief of Staff). Dunstan wanted Stretton and Ward wanted Platten. Bakewell wanted to know what the expectations of the CADC were and what it was to achieve. He suggested Hart, or his deputy Doug Speechley, could be the third member but this was strenuously opposed. Hart was considered to be very capable but he had been appointed by the Opposition Party and was seen as Playford’s man. Other names were suggested but the Premier decided he wanted someone with some power.
Bakewell (Bakewell, Bob, ohi 11 / 45:51, Adelaide, 14 June 2007) recalls:

Dunstan pointed the finger at me. I was very concerned about the time implications as I was effectively the coordinator of policy matters for the government. But the Premier insisted that the CADC was very important and so I agreed to do it for three months to see what was involved. I did get the Premier to agree that the prime purpose of the Committee was to provide a holding operation in the City while the Planning Study was carried out for the Council.

Bakewell makes the important point that the CADC was in place to enable a planning study of the City to be carried out. Platten contends Peter Ward was an influence on Dunstan’s view of the City as a cultural artefact. From an architectural perspective the quality, texture and scale of Adelaide was being lost and degradation was setting in. Platten (Platten, Newell, ohi 10 / 7:11, Adelaide, 7 May 2007) advises:

Peter Ward, Premier Dunstan’s Chief of Staff, was a supporter of my work with Robert Dickson before I joined the SA Housing Trust. Ward approached me to be a member of the State’s new City of Adelaide Development Committee which was to prevent Adelaide becoming a city with a small core downtown, deserted after business hours, and surrounded by open lot car parks.

Stretton recalls he was personally invited to be a member of the CADC by Dunstan (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 38:40, North Adelaide, 11 April 2007). John Brine, the deputy member to Stretton, remembers how he was appointed and observes he was the only deputy member (Brine, John, ohi 6 / 25:30, Adelaide, 19 April 2007):

Hugh Stretton invited me out to lunch and Peter Ward, Dunstan’s Chief of Staff, was present. I think my ‘political correctness’ was being checked out and I obviously passed the test as Hugh later invited me to be his Deputy on the CADC for the whole of 1973 while he was on study leave in London. I attended most the of CADC meetings from January to December 1973. Interestingly, the other two State members of the CADC (Bakewell and Platten) did not have deputies.

In this Section the choice of the three ACC elected members and the three State appointees (and one deputy), with the Lord Mayor of the day as the ex officio Chairman has been examined. It is argued these individuals were critical to the success of the CADC through the considerable influence they brought to bear, individually and collectively, in setting a new direction for the City. The governance arrangement for planning the City with a mixture of elected and appointed individuals in a joint City/State body was innovative and different to anything else in Australia at the time. In the next Section the operation and influence of the CADC will be analysed.
3.1.5 OPERATION AND INFLUENCE OF THE CADC

This Section describes the operation of the CADC and I argue the influence of the CADC on planning the City was considerable. Once the membership of the CADC had been formalised it began to meet regularly every Monday evening in the Colonel Light Room of the Town Hall. The working relationship between the ACC and State members developed over time. From the ACC perspective, Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 74:77, College Park, 16 April 2007) expresses the view:

I felt that in the early meetings of the CADC the government representatives were quite wary of the Council members but over time there was an understanding that we were motivated by the good of the City and not self interest or money.

Stretton observes from the State’s perspective (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 42:44, North Adelaide 11 April 2007):

Initially there was some distrust and suspicion but it ultimately proved to be a very effective group of people with a good working relationship. There were regular Monday evening meetings.

Williams provides some insight into the relationship between the CADC and the ACC administration. Arland and Bubb had been deliberately kept out of any discussions and meetings by Hayes and the three Councillors. Arland was trying to find out what was going on in the CADC and he expected to be kept informed. Hayes had emphasised at the first formal meeting of the CADC that everything was to be treated as confidential. Williams sought the advice of the Assistant Crown Solicitor (Michael Bowering), who advised Williams his first loyalty was to the CADC not to the Town Clerk. Williams therefore only provided very general information to Arland and the confidential matters remained confidential. Williams (Williams, John, ohi 7 / 61:66, Leabrook, 20 April 2007) advises:

For the first year of the CADC I was the only staff member present. During the first six months the CADC was concerned only with policy – it did not see any planning applications. The First Statement of Policy was prepared by Stretton and Platten. I had to have it produced in confidence by the Council’s printer.

The first task of the CADC was to issue a policy statement and adopt Planning Directives. The First Statement of Policy (City of Adelaide Development Committee, 1972) was a strategic and statutory document. As advised by Williams it was prepared by Stretton and Platten, endorsed by the other members and then adopted on 26 October 1972 just one week after the CADC had been formally appointed. I argue that this document represented, for the first time in Australia, an integration of strategic and statutory approaches to planning the City and thereby was innovative.

Stretton (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 44:48, North Adelaide, 11 April 2007) stresses the importance of the policy document in relation to residential renewal in the City:
The CADC issued its *First Statement of Policy* and this was prepared by Newell and me and endorsed by the other members. This was critical as it restricted the demolition of residential properties and no change of use from an existing residential use was permitted. The CADC was also able to issue Directives and legal advice was provided by the Assistant Crown Solicitor Michael Bowering.

Platten (Platten, Newell, ohi 10 / 39:45, Adelaide, 7 May 2007) reflects on what the CADC was trying to achieve and how it operated:

I worked very closely with Hugh Stretton to write the *First Statement of Policy* for the CADC. Our approach was to fine grain, sympathetically scaled, restocking of Adelaide’s run-down housing, including the restoration of existing houses. There were lots of little chats and informal meetings but all the other members of the CADC agreed on the general direction. After a few months of the CADC working together, there were never really any differences about where the City should be headed.

Bakewell explained to the Committee he was not a planner, architect or developer and was on the Committee as an administrator to give some ‘common sense’ advice (Bakewell, Bob, ohi 11 / 59:61, Adelaide, 14 June 2007).

The *First Statement of Policy* was an important document for the development of the City; it defined the powers and functions of the CADC and dealt with the mechanics of lodging applications for planning approval and building work. Business and development would continue while a major planning study of the City was carried out. The three major functions of the CADC were stated as:-

- to act at once to reverse the decline of residences and to prevent any other deterioration in the City’s fabric.
- to attend to citizens’ planning applications without delay.
- to make zoning modifications, where required, with such modifications open to full public debate, objection and revision.

The planning staff in the City Engineer’s Department had to contend with an entirely new system of planning and development control in the City. Geoff Wagner (Principal Planning Officer) reflects on the initial difficulties (Wagner, Geoff, ohi 19 / 29:36, Burnside, 7 November 2007):

The creation of the CADC caused complexity and confusion. The development industry had to come to terms with having to get an approval before anything could be done, and this was totally new and unheard of in the City. The joint City/State body was a political reality and there was complete control over land use and any building work, including demolition.

A strategic approach was inherent in the two most important policies adopted and the statutory approach was in the form of a table of categories of land use for eight zones in the City. Thus there
was integration of the two approaches in the First Statement of Policy (CADC 1972, p.9). The two policies which were to have a considerable impact on planning the City were:-

RESIDENTIAL LAND

Land in residential use, or whose last use was residential, may not be made over to other uses, except at locations where no practical possibility exists of restoring a tolerable residential environment. This applies in all zones. Conversion from other uses to residential may be permitted in any zone where the local environment is suitable. Wherever the local environment is suitable for small scale, medium-density family housing which is traditional to the City, that character must be retained. It must not be spoiled by intrusions of walk-up flats. Flats will be permitted where they do not conflict with local character and scale, for example in areas of mixed use, especially where flats can provide residences in areas whose established scale or commercial uses would discourage new family housing.

DEMOLITION

Except for reasons of health or safety, demolition will normally only be permitted upon approval of replacement buildings or uses.

Wagner thinks the First Statement of Policy was initially perceived as rather naïve but the more it was applied the more it became accepted. He observes (Wagner, Geoff, ohi 19 / 72:78, Burnside, 7 November 2007):

There was a fundamental change in land use policy, especially in the south-east and the south-west of the City. These areas had been written off, but the policy was to reclaim them as residential areas. The policy that land in residential use could not be converted into another use was a simple statement, but had a massive impact.

The policy brought about a significant change and I argue that if it had not been introduced, the residential redevelopment of the City would not have occurred. But at the time it was hard for most people to understand as there had been no residential development in the City for many years and the number of residents was declining. Thus the viability of any new residential development in South Adelaide was seriously questioned. However, the public, architects and developers came to realise there were new rules in place.

Michael Bowering, the Assistant Crown Solicitor at the time and legal advisor to the CADC, recalls there was some debate as to whether the Crown Solicitor’s Office (CSO) should be involved with the CADC. In Bowering’s view the innovative CADC was really a bit of a ‘quango’ as it was a mixture of
the ACC and the State. Ken Litchfield (principal legal advisor to the ACC) considered he should retain his role of advising the ACC; the CADC should obtain its own legal advice. The Crown Solicitor (Toby Gordon) and Bowering did not support CSO involvement as the CADC did not fit the Public Service protocols but Dunstan decided the CSO would be the CADC’s legal advisor (Bowering, Michael, ohi 22 / 19:23, Brighton, 20 November 2007).

Planning Directive No. 1 to give effect to the residential policy was then prepared by Bowring and signed by Hayes as Chairman of the CADC; it was published in the Gazette on 14 December 1972 (p.2632). Platten reflects on the role of the CADC in relation to residential development in the City (Platten, Newell, ohi 10 / 51:54, Adelaide, 7 May 2007):

I was surprised at the enormous amount of power that the CADC had. No-one was able to challenge or appeal its decisions, it had complete control over what could and could not be built in the city. In terms of its policy role, the CADC took a very strong stand about the need to address the decline of the City’s residential population.

The CADC had the power and influence to affect the design of development which did not exist anywhere else in Australia in the early 1970s. Platten observes applications were often deferred to enable improvements in design to be made and the CADC ‘nudged things in the right direction’ to achieve better outcomes. Platten contends it was remarkable that although the CADC had this enormous power, no-one had ever tried to bribe him or suggest that if he voted one way or another he could expect to receive a benefit (Platten, Newell, ohi 10 / 86:88, Adelaide, 7 May 2007):

This was unique in South Australia and in stark contrast to the way things were done in the other States where a ‘brown paper bag’ was an accepted part of the application process by the development industry.

Williams (Williams, John, ohi 7 / 73:78, Leabrook, 20 April 2007) viewed the thrust of the residential proposals as primarily a direction from the State and observes:

I found it somewhat ironic that the two Council members who were concerned with the more lucrative commercial development in their professional lives, Bowen and Roche, should be going along with the move back to residential in the City. But it was also evident that if the Council did not go along with the direction that was being set by the State, the CADC would remain the planning authority for the City and the Council would lose all its planning powers.

At the time the CADC was established the SAHT did not own property in the City. As discussed in Chapter 2.2, the primary role of the SAHT was to provide new housing in the developing metropolitan area. However, Stretton as Deputy Chair of the SAHT used his influence to amend the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement in 1973 to allow the SAHT to purchase and rehabilitate existing houses in established areas. It did this most notably in the City where the stock of rental
housing was scattered with some of it being located near the institutions and hospitals needed by
some tenants (Patience & Pugh 1984, p.107).

Bowen contends Dunstan had an ongoing personal interest in the City and that Bakewell had a very
nice way of conveying things to the CADC without it appearing that they were “instructions” from the
Premier. Bowen recalls the way the CADC operated in practice (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 81:84, College
Park, 16 April 2007):

After Council meetings on a Monday afternoon, the CADC would have dinner in the basement
restaurant of Quelltaler House (owned by Bill Hayes) and there was a lot of informal
discussion on key issues. The formal CADC meeting would then be in the Colonel Light Room
of the Town Hall at 8pm.

Bakewell (Bakewell, Bob, ohi 11 / 75:84, Adelaide, 14 June 2007) was in a position of influence and
aware of other things going on across all of government and reflects on his own role:

I would have a meeting with the Premier on Tuesday mornings to go through Cabinet
decisions. On these occasions the Premier was always very interested in what had gone on in
the CADC meeting the night before. Ministers often sought information about what was going
on in their areas but I always advised them the Committee proceedings were confidential and I
was the Premier’s representative.

When Clampett followed Hayes as Lord Mayor in 1973 he automatically became the Chairman of the
CADC in terms of the legislation. Clampett (Clampett, Bob, ohi 9 / 17:20, Mount Barker, 30 April
2007) observes:

We went to the restaurant in Quelltaler House for a meal on Monday evenings before the
CADC meetings. A lot of informal discussions about the City and particular applications took
place there before the formal meeting - that is how we did things.

It has been argued in this Section that because of the cooperation between a reformist Premier
Dunstan and a reformist Lord Mayor Hayes a governance arrangement for the City was put in place in
the form of an innovative joint ACC/State planning body. The role and influence of Stretton was
important in developing this concept which changed the direction of the City. The CADC adopted an
integration of strategic and statutory approaches which arrested the decline of the residential
population in the City, particularly in South Adelaide, and provided a holding operation for a planning
study of the City to be carried out. The Brief for the study is included in Appendix 12 and the choice
of consultants for the study is examined in the next Section.
3.1.6 CHOOSING A CONSULTANT FOR THE PLANNING STUDY

In this Section the influences on the choice of a consultant for the Planning Study are analysed. Although Bubb was intending to carry out the Planning Study, Hains (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 25:29, Salisbury, 14 November 2007) contends the reason it was carried out by consultants was a sign of the ACC’s lack of faith in its own staff to do the job and the State’s lack of faith in the SPA to do it either:

The political leaders of both the Council and the State wanted something different because they saw the problems of the existing instruments of planning.

The Council appointed a Select Committee (the four members of the CADC) to assess the 25 submissions which were received for the Planning Study. All the submissions were initially reviewed administratively by Bubb, Currie and Wagner. They recommended seven firms for short-listing to the Select Committee and provided reasons for not recommending the other 18 (see Appendix 1).

There is considerable political background to the choice of George Clarke & Urban Systems Corporation (USC) as the consultants to prepare the Planning Study. For example, Clarke attended the RAPI Conference in Brisbane in September 1972 and met with Dunstan when Dunstan was critical of the SPA and advised that a different planning approach was being considered for Adelaide.

Darrel Conybeare was working in the Sydney office of USC when consultants were sought for the Adelaide Planning Study. Clarke gave Conybeare the job of going to Adelaide to talk to Stretton as Conybeare’s father was a close friend of Professor Duncan at the University of Adelaide’s History Department where Stretton was based. There were many discussions between Conybeare and Stretton, and Conybeare gained some very useful insights in terms of pitching the response to the consultant brief. Stretton’s influence is clear as he advised Conybeare (Conybeare, Darrel, ohi 16 / 78:82, Sydney, 24 October 2007) to address three issues: Firstly, the importance of housing, especially low cost housing as provided by the SAHT. Secondly, the importance of the Park Lands and how to minimise the inroads into them by eliminating unnecessary pathways and roads to create larger broad sweeps of open Park Lands. Thirdly, there was a need to reinforce the heritage of Light’s plan for Adelaide.

---

65 Adelaide City Archives. Box 0516/0001.1972 Accession No. 517.
66 At Clarke’s request the researcher (in his then capacity of Deputy City Planner of Sydney) was present at the meeting with Dunstan at this RAPI conference when the planning consultancy for Adelaide was discussed.
In early August 1972 the Council determined a short list of four consultants rather than the seven firms proposed by the administration. One of these four firms (D Wolbrink & Associates USA with Interplan from Melbourne) had not been recommended by the administration but Chappel used his influence to have them included. He considered his colleague Peter McIntyre of Interplan would be the ideal consultant to work in Adelaide but Chappel (Chappel, John, ohi 2 / 10:12, Kent Town, 13 April 2007) observes:

> There was a view that Adelaide needed to get the best possible advice and applications were widely invited.

The Select Committee, with the three State members of the CADC, interviewed the four short-listed firms in the Town Hall on the evening of 25 September 1972. Arland was also in attendance but not Bubb. All the consultants were asked how they would approach the task and what the ACC would actually get for the fees proposed. The respective fees in the four submissions were -

- UDPA/Hassell/Kinnaird Hill deRohen & Young - $400,000
- Pak-Poy & Associates - $235,000
- D Wolbrink & Associates with Interplan - $228,000
- USC and George Clarke - $165,000

It is of interest that none of the interviewees quoted above commented on the fact that the proposal by USC & Clarke was by far the lowest tender; all the emphasis for the selection of Clarke was his planning experience in Sydney. Clarke commented at his interview “If I could find people in Adelaide as good as my own staff, USC would be glad to use them”.

While the Council was paying for the Planning Study, Hayes had arranged that the government members of the CADC would be involved in making the decision about the consultant. Hayes gave a progress report to the October Council meeting stating the Select Committee, with the assistance of the three State members of the City of Adelaide Development Committee, had interviewed four short-listed applicants. Hayes advised one consultant was favoured but a final recommendation had yet to be made.

---

67 Adelaide City Archives, Town Clerk’s File 91/72.
68 Adelaide City Archives, Town Clerk’s File 656/Confidential record of Select Committee meeting, p.7.
69 See Minutes of the meeting of the ACC 16 October 1972, p.335.
The three State members (and deputy) of the CADC reflect on the choice of George Clarke & USC for the Planning Study. Stretton (Stretton, Hugh, ohi 1 / 50:53, North Adelaide, 11 April 2007) advises:

I had met George Clarke while I was preparing my book. George had seemed engaging, interesting, inventive and original in his thinking and I thought we should use him.

Platten was approached by Peter McIntyre of Melbourne to be the local representative and part of McIntyre's team while consultants were preparing submissions and this put Platten in a difficult position. He remembers (Platten, Newell, ohi 10 / 46:51, Adelaide, 7 May 2007):

I was rather ambivalent about this and I was aware that the McIntyre consultancy from Melbourne was being supported by Chappel.

Bakewell (Bakewell, Bob, ohi 11 / 88:91, Adelaide, 14 June 2007) recalls the influence of Dunstan:

I had sat in on a meeting between George Clarke and the Premier before George was awarded the Adelaide job. Dunstan had made it clear he thought George should get the job. I know Hugh Stretton was also strongly supportive of George.

Brine, Stretton's deputy, was on the CADC when the consultants were carrying out the Planning Study and he (Brine, John, ohi 6 / 35:40, Adelaide, 19 April 2007) contends:

There had been a strong influence behind the scenes from Stretton and Dunstan was happy for George to be appointed as the consultant.

Williams (Secretary of the CADC) (Williams, John, ohi 7 / 84:89, Leabrook, 20 April 2007) also recalls the USC submission:

At one meeting Stretton commented that there was a chap in Sydney (George Clarke) who had just completed a remarkable Plan for that city. The registrations of interest for the consultancy were complex but the one from George Clarke and Urban Systems Corporation was really quite outstanding. It was therefore no surprise that he got the job.

From the Council perspective Bowen and Roche considered Clarke was the best consultant to undertake the Planning Study because of his experience with the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan* (SCC, 1971) and that the other three firms did not have the necessary expertise or were equipped to do the work expected. Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 83:89, College Park, 16 April 2007) remembers:

Chappel, was actively supporting the Interplan consortium which included Peter McIntyre and a local respected architect, Jack McConnell, and a great deal of lobbying went on.

However, Roche (Roche, John, ohi 4 / 14:17, North Adelaide, 17 April 2007) recalls a reservation about Clarke's appointment:

One of my concerns was how much work Clarke would do himself and the amount of time he would spend in Adelaide.
The Council decided in November 1972 “Subject to a mutually acceptable agreement being negotiated and the consultant agreeing to specific points, Urban Systems Corporation Pty Ltd (USC) be appointed as the primary consultant to undertake a planning study for the development of the City of Adelaide.”

Maxwell Whiting, Civic Reporter of *The Advertiser* (23 November 1972, p.1) wrote that a Sydney firm of consultants, whose principal was George Clarke, had been chosen to prepare a master plan that would take the City of Adelaide into the next century. He quoted Hayes as saying the preparation and implementation of the new master plan would be the most important thing to happen to the City since Colonel Light laid it out in 1837. In the *News* (23 November 1972, p.11) Urban Affairs Reporter Garth Rawlins reported that Clarke & Urban Systems Corporation had been appointed as the consultants to prepare a ‘blueprint’ for the City at a cost of $150,000. There was a similar article in *The Australian* (25 November 1972, p.13) where it was noted Clarke would commute from his Sydney office to Adelaide and Clarke’s early view was that there was a considerable portion of land in South Adelaide which could become residential.

The contract between the ACC and USC & George Clarke was signed on 20 December 1972. It provided *inter alia*, Clarke would act as the Project Director and spend 75 man days on the study, visiting Adelaide at least 30 times; there would be four professional teams headed up by three senior planners from the Sydney office, and one from the Melbourne office of USC; Hignett would manage the local office; the study would start on 1 February 1973 and run for 16 calendar months, and the Final Report would include the required Supplementary Development Plan. However, Clarke had sensibly inserted another clause which provided that in the light of investigations for the Planning Study an alternative to the Supplementary Development Plan could be recommended as a means of implementation.

In a further article in *The Advertiser*, (29 December 1972, p.3) Whiting wrote the man who hopes to wave a magic wand over the City arrived from Sydney yesterday. Clarke said the task was to transform an unattractive environment so that people would want to live, work and play in the City, and tourists would want to come. He will ask the Council to establish a community planning headquarters for the City which will be open to the public every day and where the latest ideas and sketches of the planners would be on display.

---

70 See Minutes of the meeting of the ACC 27 November 1972, p.392.
71 George Clarke’s personal papers, Box 20 (City of Adelaide) Item No.39.
The influences on the choice of Clarke & USC for the Planning Study have been identified in this Section. The four Phases of the Planning Study will be analysed in the next Section.

3.1.7 THE CITY OF ADELAIDE PLANNING STUDY

The importance of the Planning Study and the influence of Clarke are examined in this Section. Clarke visited Adelaide in January 1973 and met with Arland and Bubb from the ACC, and with Bakewell and Heads of relevant agencies from the State. I argue Dunstan intended to influence the Planning Study though the innovative CADC and that one of his main objectives was the residential renewal of the City. At a Reception to welcome Clarke to Adelaide in the Town Hall on 24 January 1973, Dunstan said:

The City of Adelaide Development Committee is a statutory body unique to Australian Government, joining as it does a State Government with its preeminent Local Government organisation. Adelaide is the heart of the metropolitan area, the property of all its people, the capital of the State, the centre of the region, and the home of 12,000 residents which I hope will become 40,000.

Clarke was supposed to establish a planning team with senior planners for the Study in terms of the contract. In fact he only appointed Peter Hignett as the initial Project Manager and employed a number of recent local graduates to do the work. The planning team is shown in Appendix 13 and without any real direction from Clarke, Hignett and the team set about preparing Phase 1.

The Study commenced 1 February 1973 and was divided into four phases of four months each (USC 1974, p.16). These were:

- Phase 1: Identification and analysis of basic data and of major problems and opportunities.
- Phase 2: Evolution of planning concepts.
- Phase 3: Analysis, discussion and revision of planning concepts
- Phase 4: Production of the City of Adelaide Plan, together with statutory instruments, action projects and administrative procedures to implement the Plan.

Commonwealth and State involvement was sought for the Planning Study. The Lord Mayor wrote to 13 Federal Ministers in May 1973 seeking Commonwealth cooperation to engage in the Study. The Premier wrote to 87 Government Ministers, heads of departments and agencies in June requesting their input to the Study. An Open Letter was also published in The Australian, The Advertiser and the

---

72 Adelaide City Archives, CE&P Department File 56/73.
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News (14 June 1973) seeking submissions to identify major problems confronting the City, and what
the City Plan should include.\textsuperscript{74}

The first stage of the Planning Study was to undertake a base line analysis of the issues and
opportunities for the City. Clarke assumed this was simply a data gathering stage without the need
for any innovative thoughts and when the first Progress Report was submitted at the end of May Bubb
wrote a covering report on it for the Select Committee.\textsuperscript{75} The Committee was expecting some ideas
and direction but all Clarke had provided was a huge amount of data. Bubb considered the report had
serious shortcomings about the output, the range of investigations undertaken, the data that was still
to be collected, and a lack of policy direction. He recommended that the Committee express its
concerns and hold discussions with USC about them.\textsuperscript{76}

Linn (2006, p.252) states that despite the antagonism between Hayes and Arland, when the Report
was considered by the Select Committee they agreed the Report should be taken away and re-written
entirely; this was a stronger response than Bubb’s recommendation. The Report was re-written and
then Clarke personally presented it to the Council on 25 June 1973.

Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 95:99, College Park, 16 April 2007) advises that Arland was then directed
to lay down the law in terms of the contact and unless Clarke performed personally he would be
dismissed from the project. Lloyd-Jones (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 23:29, Urrbrae, 6 November
2007) contends Clarke realised that he had completely misread the politics in Adelaide and had
almost been dismissed at the end of Phase 1. Roche and Bowen became increasingly concerned at
Clarke’s lack of personal involvement and their views, and Clarke’s method of working, are included in
Appendix 14.

Phase 2 commenced in June 1973 and was due for completion by the end of September. Bowen and
Roche began to exert some influence and became actively involved with the team. Presentations
were often done on Sundays; Clarke would introduce his team but let them do the presentation as
obviously Clarke had not done much work himself (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 90:95, College Park, 16 April
2007). Roche used to drop in to the USC office most evenings to see what was going on and have

\textsuperscript{74} Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/M/1.
\textsuperscript{75} Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/L.
\textsuperscript{76} See Minutes of the ACC 21 June 1973, confidential section - pages not numbered.
discussions with Hains, Gavin Lloyd-Jones, Horner and Jarrott as Clarke himself was not there very often (Roche, John, ohi 4 / 29:35, North Adelaide, 17 April 2007).

During the second phase Clarke made a lot of flying visits to Adelaide from Sydney but his approach was still to use the young team as the workhorses. However, he started to understand the politics and influences and thus spent time with Bowen and Roche to make sure he was on track from the ACC point of view, as well as with Dunstan and Stretton from the State’s perspective. Hains (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 56:59, Salisbury, 14 November 2007) makes an interesting observation about the influence of Dunstan and Stretton:

Often on a Sunday morning George would have a discussion about the City with Don Dunstan and Hugh Stretton sitting on the swings at the Glover playground in North Adelaide.

While the team was pretty ‘green’ the individuals did have some expertise in their own areas, but there was not anyone who had the capacity and ability to understand the big picture. This was Clarke’s strength - he could take the overall view and hit just the right targets (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 30:38, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007).

As Phase 2 of the Study progressed, the relationship between Clarke and Hignett deteriorated. Hignett (Hignett, Peter, ohi 17 / 42:45, Adelaide, 5 November 2007) recalls:

I was feeling quite a lot of pressure as George was hardly in Adelaide and not providing any direction for the work. The team was falling over itself to get progress reports done but without help from George. I went to see Lord Mayor Clampett and said I was going to leave. Clampett tried to persuade me to stay on, but I wrote to George and my employment on the project ceased.

Currie (Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 66:71, Dulwich, 24 April 2007) recalls Hignett did not get on with Clarke and was replaced after a few months by Stephen Hains as the Team Leader. Hains (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 11:18, Salisbury, 14 November 2007) recalls his appointment as the Project Coordinator for the remainder of the Planning Study:

I was asked by George to take over as the Project Coordinator. When I was appointed Glyn (Jarrott) the office manager was not happy as he thought he should have got the job. George did not like conflict and he called me Project Coordinator rather than Project Manager.

Clarke arranged for Martyn Webb (from Perth) to give a critique of the progress of the Study to a meeting of the Select Committee in September. Despite this briefing, the Select Committee decided it needed to have a greater degree of supervision over the Planning Study and a further meeting was held when Bakewell, Brine and Platten were invited to attend. The Select Committee advised USC that the Second Progress Report had to be submitted by 1 October 1973 and must include a
complete statement detailing the output of the Study. Arland was directed to ensure Clarke understood he would be obliged to comply with these requirements.77

Even while Stretton was in London during the whole of 1973 on study leave he exerted influence. Stretton wrote an important letter to Clarke in September about the governance of the City, separate legislation and a joint Crown Review Body.78 He stated:

I will be of use in seeing what you propose is accepted and implemented. Please do not forget that the political conditions for serious innovation, including legislation, are promising. I hope that you will propose permanent planning machinery to replace the CADC which perpetuates some comparable State share in the management of the City. Reach out to Dunstan and Bakewell to help you and advise you as to what to propose.

This advice and the influence of Stretton are clearly reflected in Clarke’s thinking and the final recommendations of the Planning Study. The initial planning concepts which emerged from Phase 2 were presented to the Council on 1 October 1973 as Clarke had been directed.79 The Report contained possible Objectives, Policies and Priorities for Action for the City. It was also presented to the CADC (Roche, John, ch 4 / 29:31, North Adelaide, 17 April 2007). The draft Objectives covered Work; Learning; Leisure; Living; History; Landscape; Townscape; Pollution Control; Pedestrians; Public Transport; Vehicular traffic; Parking; Administration; Finance; Public Enterprise, and Planning & Development Control.80

Three alternatives for the City were presented. Each assumed a core of intensive office development, an inner area of mixed commercial uses, and an outer area of residential and some commercial uses. The alternatives differed in intensity of development for generalised categories of land uses. The options were presented in a series of clear overlays so that a picture could be built up. Residential uses (orange); wholesaling (magenta) and offices (blue) could be combined to form the basis for statutory controls. The 16 draft Objectives were supported by draft Policies and Priorities for Action. As well as the concepts for the future distribution of land use activities, there were alternative overall concepts for environmental design and transportation patterns (USC 1974, p.16). At this stage it was still envisaged the outcome would be a statutory City Plan.

---

77 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/D/3.
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79 See Minutes of the meeting of the ACC 9 October 1973, p.322.
80 George Clarke’s personal papers, Box 20a (City of Adelaide) Item No.1.
Phase 3 - analysis, discussion and revision of planning concepts - was due for completion at the end of January 1974. During Phase 3 the Select Committee continued to provide considerable political oversight and influence (meetings were held on 1, 9, 15 and 29 October; on 5, 12, and 19 November, and on 10 December 1973). Currie, as Liaison Officer, was required to give a report on the work done by USC in the previous week; the new Project Coordinator, Hains, was required to give a report on the work that would be done in the next week.\textsuperscript{81} Hains (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 19:25, Salisbury, 14 November 2007) advises:

George saw the importance of Town Clerk Arland and I provided Arland with the weekly report. The Town Clerk knew which way the political wind was blowing and he was surprisingly supportive. Bubb the City Engineer was completely sidelined.

The Select Committee decided the Planning Centre would be at 41 Pirie Street (near the Town Hall) for the exhibition of outputs from the Planning Study.\textsuperscript{82} It was jointly opened on 24 October 1973 by Clampett and Dunstan. The Premier’s personal involvement underlined the importance of the governance issue the State placed on the future direction of the City. The proposals were given the widest possible publicity and individual citizens, community groups and governmental agencies were encouraged to provide comments, criticism and suggestions to the planning team who were in attendance at the centre. The Planning Centre (Figure 25) was brightly painted and hard to miss to encourage the widest possible participation in the process.

During November and December numerous small meetings of interested groups were held at the Planning Centre.\textsuperscript{83} Clarke (1972), based on his work in Sydney, was seeking a City Plan which would have broad public support and consensus but there would need to be some form of zoning technique implemented with ‘performance standards’. Lawson (1978, p.58) states the USC approach to planning incorporated explicit performance standards. Hains advises (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 31:36, Salisbury, 14 November 2007) a large percentage of the consultant budget was spent on public participation which was an innovation in South Australia. Public involvement through the Planning Centre was extensive with input from resident groups, city workers and businesses.

\textsuperscript{81} Adelaide City Archives, Town Clerk’s File No.656/M/2. 
\textsuperscript{82} Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/D/2. 
\textsuperscript{83} George Clarke’s personal papers. Box 20 (City of Adelaide) Item No.35.
An innovative and different approach to development control emerged during Phase 3. Rather than the traditional approach of lines on a map with permitted, consent and prohibited uses, emphasis was placed on a word picture called a “ Desired Future Character Statement” (DFC) of an area. This attempted to spell out what sort of place and amenity was to be created in each locality. This allowed developers to see how land might be developed and what their development was expected to contribute. There were no longer black and white controls but a balance between the competing forces of the desire for certainty and the need for flexibility. A developer had to demonstrate that a proposal would contribute to, rather than detract from, the attainment of the DFC for the area. Hains provides some insight into the origins of the innovative DFCs (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 53:57, Salisbury, 14 November 2007):

The concept of Desired Future Character Statements for Precincts was primarily the work of David Horner, Gavin Lloyd-Jones, Geoff Wagner and me but George contributed.

During this period the CADC continued its statutory functions of assessing development applications. Wagner attended the meetings and initially was assisted by Hignett and then by Hains (Wagner, Geoff, ohi 19 / 49:54, Burnside, 7 November 2007). Hains recalls he was party to the informal as well as formal discussions in the CADC (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 71:76, Salisbury, 14 November 2007):

After Peter Hignett left, I sat in on the CADC meetings to give advice on individual planning applications. What was particularly interesting was the informal discussion over drinks in the Lord Mayor’s Room after the CADC meetings and these revealed a lot about what the members of the CADC were really thinking.
Clarke presented the Third Progress Report to the Council (and the CADC) at the end of January 1974. 84 As Stretton had suggested it contained a different approach to planning and development control in the City through a separate Act. Partly as a result of this report which proposed an innovative and different approach to city planning the Council decided to split the Department of Engineering and Planning and have two separate positions of City Engineer and City Planner. It was the Lord Mayor’s role to advise Bubb of this decision and Clampett (Clampett, Bob, ohi 9 / 33:38, Mount Barker, 30 April 2007) recalls meeting Bubb:

I called Hugh Bubb into the Lord Mayor’s office and told him what the Council was going to do. I asked Bubb what would he rather be – the City Engineer or the City Planner? I told Bubb that I had already written down on a piece of paper what would be his response as I thought I knew what he would say. Bubb said he wanted to be the City Engineer and I gave him the piece of paper – I had judged correctly. We had a drink and I wished him the best.

Advertisements were then placed throughout Australia by the Council for the new position of City Planner of Adelaide. 85

The fourth Phase of the Study commenced on 1 February 1974. Dunstan influenced a letter Bakewell wrote to Clarke in late February. Bakewell supported the concept of Precincts and the use of the innovative Desired Future Character Statements as the way to manage the City. He stressed the need for low cost housing and improved public transport. Bakewell also suggested the final Report should detail means of dealing with adverse effects of the car. 86

The Select Committee and the State members of the CADC concluded the City needed to have its own legislation; this would be very different from the zoning model of the SPA. The State considered that if this new approach to planning could work in the City, it could eventually be extended to the rest of the metropolitan area. This was consistent with Dunstan’s view of Adelaide setting the pace for the rest of Australia (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 87:91, Salisbury, 14 November 2007).

In April the Select Committee, accompanied by Arland, met with Dunstan to discuss the progress of the Study. The Premier advised that he was happy with the way in which the concepts had been brought forward by USC. In terms of governance he considered that City/State cooperation was essential and it was important this continued (especially given the extent of the State’s ownership of buildings in the City). The city planning concepts were generally accepted by the State and Dunstan

84 See Minutes of the ACC Meeting 25 February 1974, p.771.
85 The researcher (then the Deputy City Planner in Sydney) with Clarke’s encouragement applied for this new position.
86 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/M/2.
agreed that a new Act was necessary as the existing legislation was not appropriate for the sort of system Clarke proposed.  

Roche (Roche, John, ohi 4 /37:38, North Adelaide, 17 April 2007) contends Clarke had realised the importance of integrating strategic and statutory planning approaches and did not want Adelaide to be in the same position as Sydney with its problems resulting from a lack of such an approach. Therefore a new Act was needed. Lloyd-Jones (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 42:44, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007) was of the same opinion and explains:

I felt that George had reached the conclusion, probably based on his experience in Sydney with statutory/strategic planning, that separate legislation for the City was the only way to go and that was what the Study finally recommended.

I argue the elements for the final report came from many sources. While drafts had been prepared by the planning team, Clarke was influenced politically by Dunstan and by the members of the CADC, particularly Stretton, Bowen and Roche. However, Hains contends (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 66:71, Salisbury, 14 November 2007):

The end result was still largely the work of the team and not many things were changed by the politicians, indeed George fought strongly for the independence of the process.

Bowering (Bowering, Michael, ohi 22 / 77:82, Brighton, 20 November 2007) reflects on the Planning Study and Hart's position:

I thought the Planning Study was well thought out and would address the problems of the zoning of the whole of the square mile as commercial under the provisions of the Metropolitan Development Plan. I would often talk informally with Stuart Hart on the train on the way to work. George had recommended an entirely different approach from the SPA with separate legislation for the City and Stuart had not supported this at all.

The Final Report of the Planning Study contained an Explanatory Statement and three separate Books. Book 1, the draft City Plan, contained Preliminaries; Objectives and Policies; Concept Diagrams; Desired Future Character Statements for Precincts; and an Implementation program. The City would be managed as a series of Districts with different purposes and character. Within Districts, Precincts would comprise an area of community interest, clustering activities and/or environmental character. This approach was very innovative and quite different from the traditional Development Plan of just land use zoning (USC 1974, p.18).

---

87 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/I.
The intensity and complexity of both existing and desired future development in the City necessitated the application of a deeper and more specialised range of performance criteria than was required in other Council areas. The specialised needs of the City would not fit into the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1972 (USC 1974, p.163). Thus “A Bill for the City of Adelaide Environment Act 1975 and Directives to be incorporated in the Second Schedule of the Act” was contained in Book 2. It was intended the new Act would authorise the whole Plan. Eight development control Directives were proposed to give legal effect to specific planning policies. The eight Directives were: 1 - Administration; 2 - Use; 3 - Density; 4 - Height; 5 - Usable Landscaped Space; 6 – Parking, Loading and Traffic; 7 - Townscape and Amenity; and 8 - Registered Places (USC1974, p.164). This last Directive about heritage later proved to be the most contentious in the community as it dealt with the protection, conservation, maintenance, and enhancement of places deemed to be of environmental, architectural, historic, scenic or scientific significance.

Book 3 contained an initial series of 26 Action Projects (Appendix 15) to implement the Objectives and Policies of the Plan. It was argued that Objectives, Policies and Desired Future Character Statements could not be achieved by control over private development alone which was seen as primarily a ‘negative’ process. The Action Projects were seen as ‘positive’ to achieve what otherwise might not occur (USC 1974, pp.214-245).

Clarke recommended the ACC should be primarily responsible for administering the planning and development control processes in the City with a “Crown Policy Review Authority” to coordinate State and ACC Policies. There would also be a new Local Government Court to deal with appeals which would absorb the functions of the existing Planning Appeal Board. Not surprisingly, the proposed joint body was identical to the CADC which consisted of the Lord Mayor as Chairman and three Government and three ACC members. Clarke had been influenced by Stretton’s advice.

The draft City Plan evolved from community demands and the discovery of needs. Clarke suggested the City was made up of three systems - Activities, Environment and Movement. Each system had physical, economic and social aspects. Further details of the draft City Plan are included in Appendix 16. Concept Diagram 19 (USC 1974, p.148) outlined the overall structure proposed by Clarke and is shown in Figure 26.
Clampett provided Dunstan with an advance copy of the USC Final Report and thanked the Premier for his personal support and interest in the Study. The consultants recommended a communication program to commence as soon as the Planning Study was received by the Council. This program included media releases, the continued use of the Planning Centre for an exhibition of the proposals, and the updating of the City Model (at a scale of 1:200) so that the impact of an individual development could be assessed as well as providing the public with an overall picture of the development of the City (USC 1974, p.247).

The *City of Adelaide Planning Study*, in the distinctive square format (280mm x 280mm) that Clarke had used for the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan, 1971* was submitted to the Council on 24 June 1974. It was popularly known as “The Red Book” because of its cover (*Figure 27*). Red is associated with strength and courage (Kohl 1998) and was an apt choice by Clarke for an innovative and different approach to planning in Adelaide compared to the other capital cities in Australia in the 1970s.

---

88 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/L.
In September the Council decided the Planning Study would be exhibited for a period of two months for public comment beginning in October. The official opening of the exhibition was by Clampett on Wednesday 23 October 1974 in the Planning Centre. Arland advised Bakewell that Dunstan and his Ministers had not been invited to the opening of the exhibition because the Council now saw the ‘Plan’ as its own and the State should not be seen as lending support to a ‘City Plan’ on which extensive public comment was going to be sought. This was despite the political influence on the Planning Study by the State through the joint City/State body.\textsuperscript{89}

It has been argued in this Section Clarke had learned the lesson from Sydney and proposed an integration of a strategic approach of Objectives and Policies with a statutory approach, in the form of separate City legislation, to control development. A particular innovation was the use of Desired Future Character Statements to create images of types of activities and townscape qualities sought for each area of the City. In terms of governance, the continuation of a joint City/State body was proposed to coordinate ACC and State policies and priorities for action. Dunstan requested the existing joint body - the CADC - to report to him on the Planning Study by the end December 1974.\textsuperscript{90} The CADC’s report is contained in Appendix 17. The Council’s response to the Planning Study is analysed in the next Section.

\textsuperscript{89} Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/M.
\textsuperscript{90} Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ninetieth meeting of the CADC 28 October 1974, p.1007.
3.1.8 RESPONSE TO THE STUDY BY THE COUNCIL

When the ACC decided to take the planning responsibility away from Bubb a new City Planner’s Department was established on 1 July 1974. Williams (Williams, John, ohi 7 / 97:99, Leabrook, 20 April 2007) advises Currie was appointed as the Acting City Planner. Horner (who had been seconded for the Planning Study), Madigan\textsuperscript{91} an engineer, Wagner and some support staff formed the basis of the new City Planner’s Department.\textsuperscript{92} The immediate task of the new City Planner (researcher) was to provide advice to the Council on the Planning Study and this is examined in this Section. The influential roles held by the researcher from this time in 1974 until 1993, in the context of City/State relations, are outlined in Figure 28. He served with nine Lord Mayors and worked with five Premiers during the period covered by this dissertation.

Bowen, Roche and Chappel considered the other Council members should become familiar with the new direction proposed for the City in the Planning Study. Special briefings were held (in confidence) every Thursday from 19 September until 28 November 1974 for this purpose. Clampett sent over 10,000 open letters to residents, owners, occupiers and the media inviting them to attend the public exhibition of the Planning Study. A notice was also published in the Gazette on 17 October 1974 about the exhibition. Clarke suggested specific meetings with particular groups, such as The North Adelaide Society and the Chamber of Commerce, and these were held during November 1974.\textsuperscript{93} Roche & Llewellyn-Smith (1975, p.110) state that the exhibition of the Planning Study included a continuous programme of slides and commentary as well as maps, photographs, graphics and text. A film was also made about the innovative “Desired Future Character Statements of Precincts” which was shown continuously on a television screen in a special area of the exhibition centre. This proved a particularly good means of communication as a visual description of planning policy could be comprehended.

As a result of the briefings about the nature of the Planning Study, the legislation and likely overall timing the City Planner was requested to recommend which Policies should be ‘Governing’ and which should be ‘Guiding’. A Governing Policy would be one which was acceptable to the ACC in the implementation of the Plan, and a Guiding Policy would be desirable but not binding on the Council.

\textsuperscript{91} Madigan’s work for Bubb was referred to in Chapter 2.3.
\textsuperscript{92} The researcher was appointed to the position of Adelaide City Planner in April 1974. After negotiations between Sydney Lord Mayor Shehadie and Adelaide Lord Mayor Clampett it was agreed the Woolloomooloo Action Project (refer Chapter 1.4) would be completed by the researcher which enabled him to arrive in Adelaide in September 1974.
\textsuperscript{93} Adelaide City Archives. City Planner’s Department File 66/74.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME LINE</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>JOINT</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Mayors</td>
<td>Town Clerks/CEOs</td>
<td>City Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Hayes*</td>
<td>Arland*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Clampett*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Roche*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Joseph*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Inglis*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Hudson*</td>
<td>Mant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Ninio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes deceased

**Figure 28** – The roles and influence of the researcher from 1974 until 1993

Source: Researcher
A Council weekend seminar was held on 7 and 8 December. Arland invited Bakewell, Stretton, Platten, Clarke and other members of the planning team to attend and assist in the discussions. The sessions were chaired by the individuals who had had the most influence in the Planning Study; Hayes, Bowen, Roche and Chapell. A particular concern which emerged was whether the Concept Diagrams, especially those related to traffic, were binding. As a result of these detailed discussions Clarke was requested to liaise with the City Planner and recommend appropriate amendments to address all the concerns expressed.\textsuperscript{94}

Public interest in the Planning Study was generated through the media and the exhibition was extended until the end of February 1975. Three proposals caused particular concern. These were the heritage issue of the creation of a Register of Places of Environmental Significance; the closure of some streets and roads, and governance of the City in terms of the establishment of a Crown Review Committee.

After the public exhibition closed the City Planner’s Department, with Clarke’s assistance, prepared ‘Discussion Papers’ for each of the Council’s five technical committees on the Objectives and Policies of the draft City Plan relevant to the respective committees. The issues raised at the seminar held in December were also addressed and comments were made on all of the 862 representations received from the public. Details of the process which was then followed by the ACC to finalise the Plan are provided in Appendix 18.

A further seminar was held on Sunday 8 June 1975 and Arland again invited Bakewell, Stretton and Platten to attend to ensure a final version of the Council’s Plan could be adopted.\textsuperscript{95} The remaining issues of concern regarding the strategic Objectives and Policies and the Diagrams were discussed and resolved.\textsuperscript{96} Arising from these discussions the City Planner and Clarke prepared a final version of the City Plan and Briefing Notes were provided to all the elected members.\textsuperscript{97} Steve Condous who was later to become Lord Mayor (Condous, Steve, ohi 30 / 18:29, Norwood, 1 March 2008) recalls the Council debate:

> There was heated argument in the Council Chamber, bearing in mind that there were a few members who considered themselves “experts”, such as Bowen, Roche and Chappel, but the proposals from the City Planner and Clarke were eventually adopted by the Council at its meeting on 23 June 1975.

\textsuperscript{94} Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/P/1.
\textsuperscript{95} See Minutes of the Meeting of the ACC 26 May 1975, p.1027.
\textsuperscript{96} Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/T/2.
\textsuperscript{97} Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/T/3.
The adopted City Plan differed significantly from the Planning Study in that it consisted of only a part of Book 1 of the consultant’s recommendations. Zacest (1978, p.90) observes the amendments and omissions in the Council’s City Plan compared to the Planning Study reflected community and State attitudes as well as input from the ACC technical Committees. The City Plan was more general and less committed to particular courses of action but it was a better structured document with more realistic demands for action by other levels of government. The proposed Register of Places was not adopted and instead there was a policy to prepare and maintain such a Register. In relation to Movement Systems a new Policy sought the cooperation of, and action by, both the State and Federal Governments. Policies about road closures became Policies for investigation rather than a commitment to closure (ibid, p.94).

The Council’s City Plan was arranged as follows:

- Part 1 – Preliminary
- Part 2 – Objectives
- Part 3 – Policies
  - Part 4 – The Desired Future Character of Precincts
- Part 5 – Implementation
- Part 6 – Diagrams

A formal notice was placed in the Gazette on 24 July 1975 advising the adopted City Plan would be on public exhibition from 14 August until 13 November 1975 in the Town Hall (the Planning Centre had been closed). All those who had made representations on the Planning Study were advised by letter and invited to make further comment. The adoption of the City Plan by the ACC concluded Clarke’s work in Adelaide and Lloyd-Jones (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 46:48, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007) recalls Clarke closed the USC office on 30 June 1975 as there was no future for it.

The issues raised during the public exhibition of the Council’s City Plan, including concerns about heritage and governance, were:

- Plot ratios, heights and expansion rights (Activity Systems)
- Usable landscaped space requirements, and Registered Places (Environmental Systems)
- Road closures (Movement Systems), and
- Function and costs of the Review Committee (Implementation).

---

98 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/T/2.
The Council’s approach to dealing with all the representations is provided in Appendix 19. Linn (2006, p.252) states the Council’s City Plan was seen to be of such importance that it was studied at the International Federation for Housing and Planning (IFHP) Conference in The Hague in August 1975. Arland had advised the ACC of this at its April meeting and the Council “authorised the Lord Mayor and City Planner to attend the IFHP Conference and present a joint paper”.

Roche & Llewellyn-Smith (1975, p.113) conclude that planning in the City was primarily a ‘political’ rather than a ‘technical’ process and that the Plan proposed for the City was an innovative and different approach to city planning which was probabilistic rather than deterministic, was flexible rather than rigid and was concerned with processes rather than long term physical plans. Roche wrote to Dunstan in April 1976 providing a brief history of the City Plan and enclosing:
- The City of Adelaide Plan (as adopted by Council on 23 June 1975)
- Copies of the 287 written representations and the City Planner’s comments on them

Roche commented that although the Council had not followed the precise steps laid down in the Planning and Development Act, 1966-72 for a Supplementary Development Plan, the actions undertaken by the ACC had been in substantial compliance with the procedures of that Act. Roche requested that the City Plan be accepted by the State as the authorised Plan for the City and that special legislation be enacted for this purpose so that a new planning system could come into operation on 1 January 1977. The ACC would draft Regulations on such essential items as land use. Roche offered to make himself and the City Planner available to discuss any aspects of the Plan with the Premier or his Ministers, and requested the opportunity to comment on any proposed legislation or any State amendments to the Plan.

In this Section the Council’s response to the Planning Study, having regard to substantial public input, has been reviewed. This resulted in the adoption of the Council’s own unique City Plan which was different from any planning system exiting in Australia at the time. Bakewell established a high-level administrative Committee to provide the State with advice on the ACC Plan and this is examined in the next Section.

---

99 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/T/12.
3.1.9 INTERDEPARTMENTAL PLAN REVIEW COMMITTEE

In this Section the advice of the State’s Interdepartmental Plan Review Committee is analysed. It was established with the following terms of reference:

- To clarify, elaborate and summarise the City of Adelaide Plan paying particular attention to financial considerations.
- To obtain responses to the Plan from relevant Government departments and statutory authorities.
- To recommend a course of action the Government should take in relation to the Plan.

Bakewell (as Chairman) directed all State Departments and Agencies to make submissions on the City Plan. These submissions ranged from concerns with the proposed Movement System to the listing of individual buildings. A summary of the submissions is included in Appendix 20.

Hart wrote to Bakewell in May with comments on the procedure the ACC should follow in relation to the City Plan to become an authorised Plan in terms of the Planning and Development Act 1966–72. Hart argued that the Act could accommodate the complex planning problems of the central city and recommended that the City Plan be exhibited as a Supplementary Development Plan. The Council could request the SPA for any desirable amendments to the Act. The SPA and ACC would need to prepare the necessary Regulations jointly. However, Hart conceded there may be some positive aspects in separate legislation for the City in that new and different ideas could be tested.

Hart (Hart, Stuart, ohi 5 / 46:64, Springfield, 18 April 2007) summarised his opposition as follows:

- The State planning system was sufficiently adaptable to be able to provide for any special conditions that may be required in the city.
- The State was trying to achieve some consistency and separate legislation would be confusing for professionals, developers and the general public.
- There would be a separate body of case law which would not be applicable elsewhere in the State.
- There would be additional administrative costs.
- If there were any problems with the State planning system (even though it had only been operating for 7 years) then it would be better to rectify these rather than have a piecemeal approach and introduce special legislation for the City.
- The special interim controls established under the Act in 1972 had worked satisfactorily (CADC) and with modification could be given permanent status.

---

100 Adelaide City Archives. City Planner's Department File P66A/74.
Daunt (1976, p.69) contends many of the Policies in the City Plan could not be realised by the ACC itself as they called for modifications of trends outside the City and massive expenditure and commitments to particular courses of action by State and Federal Governments. Daunt, as secretary of the Review Committee, argued the City Plan should not be given legal status and the ACC was more concerned with political rather than the technical considerations (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 16:18, Sydney, 23 October 2007). Blencowe (née Daunt) recognised separate legislation to give effect to the whole Plan would have implications on Departmental budgets at the State level. She (Blencowe, Sybella, ohi 21 / 54:59, Adelaide, 15 November 2007) remembers attending an all day ACC seminar where the likely cost of each policy in the City Plan was gone through in detail and recalls:

> It was clear the City was not going to give up its aim of separate legislation (as was its tradition), but equally clear the State was not going to legislate to give effect to what was primarily a policy document. Hart could not understand why there could not be a simple amendment to the State’s Planning and Development Act, 1967-72.

Bakewell requested the Lord Mayor to make the City Planner available to directly brief the Review Committee and Roche agreed. In October Bakewell wrote to Arland and outlined the findings of Review Committee. The Committee had concluded, and the influence of Hart was clear, there needed to be a reassessment of the base assumptions and projections; alternative realistic projects needed to be formulated; major projects needed to be identified; and there needed to be a different approach to the legislation as there was no reason the City Plan could not be implemented as a Supplementary Development Plan with the Directives as Regulations.

The views of the Review Committee were not surprising given the individuals who comprised the Committee. Ray Bunker was the First Assistant Secretary of the Commonwealth DURD and Minister Tom Uren had strong views about the need for decentralisation and Commonwealth investment in areas other than the capital cities; Carey was State Under-Treasurer and particularly concerned about the State’s finances; Hart, the State Director of Planning, opposed the City not being part of the State’s system as discussed earlier; Hockeridge was the Secretary of Local Government and had no reason to treat the ACC differently from any other Council; Inglis was the Head of the State Department of Environment and Conservation and was opposed to separate legislation, particularly in relation to heritage; Scrafton, as State Director of Transport, was supportive of improvements being made to public transport but aware of the total costs of what was being proposed; and Alex Ramsay

---

101 The researcher subsequently briefed the Review Committee about the process and the nature of the City Plan and attended many meetings to participate in the discussions and answer questions.

102 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/P/1.
was the General Manager of the SAHT and realised the costs of providing public housing in the City compared to new undeveloped areas.

Roche and Arland met with Dunstan and expressed concerns at the Review Committee’s findings. In effect the State bureaucrats were advising Dunstan that the City Plan should be scrapped and a new start made. This was unacceptable to the ACC. Roche argued that from the point of view of governance the CADC, as a joint City/State body, had provided oversight of the Planning Study (particularly Stretton) and had been actively involved in the evolution of the Study into the City Plan. It was therefore reasonable for the Council to assume the political direction was acceptable to the State even though the State bureaucrats now seemed to have come to a different view. The implications were that IDC would have to continue and a great deal of ratepayers’ money would have been wasted. 103

Dunstan’s response was that the State had concerns about the Council’s capacity to achieve the Objectives; about the financial implications for the State of some of the Policies, and about the implications for the rest of the metropolitan area if there was an over commitment to the City. The State would have to construct the Hindmarsh Boulevard as part of the north-south traffic corridor; build a rapid transit line to the north-east; build the City underground, and generally improve public transport. 104 However, at the end of the meeting Dunstan advised Roche that Cabinet had delegated to Hudson, Minister of Planning, the task of negotiating with the Lord Mayor a governance arrangement and City Plan that would be acceptable to the State and ACC. 105

The State’s administrative response to the City Plan has been reviewed in this Section. Hart in particular was critical of a separate system and influenced the advice to Dunstan from the Interdepartmental Committee. The Government’s political response was that it was prepared to negotiate a new governance arrangement for planning the City. The political and administrative negotiations to achieve something unique in Adelaide are examined and analysed in the next Section.

---

103 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/P/1.
104 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/P/2.
105 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/P/1.
3.1.10 CITY/STATE NEGOTIATIONS

In this Section the negotiations between the Council and the State to achieve a new governance arrangement for the City are examined. The Whitlam Government was dismissed on 11 November 1975. At the time John Mant (technically an Assistant Secretary in the NCDC) was Whitlam’s Principal Private Secretary. Mant had got to know Hudson when Hudson visited Canberra to see the Prime Minister and others about educational projects in South Australia. Mant resigned with the change of Federal government and was intending to return to Sydney and set up a law practice. But Hudson invited Mant to become an advisor in South Australia as Hudson had become the Minister for Planning.

Mant (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 8:15, Sydney, 23 October 2007) reflects:

I accepted the offer and moved to Adelaide where my principal task was to advise Hudson on how to deal with the City of Adelaide Plan which had been adopted by the Council and which the Council expected to become law.

A period of intense negotiation to finalise the plan and legislation that would be acceptable to both the State and the ACC then began (Llewellyn-Smith 1982, p.72). During this period of negotiation the Council decided to progress some of the Action Projects that had been recommended by Clarke and USC. Details of this work are shown in Appendix 21.

Roche and Hudson began regular meetings about the City Plan at the political level while Mant and the researcher had weekly meetings to discuss how best to progress the State and ACC positions, recognising that a compromise would have to be reached at some stage. Hopgood, a Minister in the Dunstan Government and later Deputy Premier, considers there was a good working relationship between Roche and Hudson. They did not always see eye to eye, but they were able to do business together and both had sharp minds with an understanding of all the governance issues (Hopgood, Don, ohi 26 / 8:23, Morphett Vale, 18 February 2008).

Mant had written design and siting policies for detached houses when he had been at the NCDC which made it clear approval had to be obtained for any development. Development control in Canberra was seen as different from managing the city. The planners in the NCDC designed subdivisions and provided blocks of land while building inspectors exercised development control through the “tick a box” method of evaluation. Thus Mant came out of a tradition of one group of
people planning the city and another group exercising development control (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 19:28, Sydney, 23 October 2007).

Mant and the researcher spent many hours working through the ACC and State positions. A critical decision was made to separate ‘strategic policies’ from ‘statutory policies’. This was to have significant implications for the nature of the planning system in the City, and later in South Australia, for many years to come. Mant (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 31:32, Sydney, 23 October 2007) recalls:

I remember that we had spent one Sunday in your home and came to the conclusion that we just had to decide what in the Plan was about policy and what was about development control.

The test of a statutory development control policy (which is still valid) was “Does this affect either positively or negatively, the value of a property?” If the answer is ‘yes’ then it is; if the answer is ‘no’, then it is a strategic and not a statutory policy. All the policies in the Plan were then worked through to determine the nature of each policy and the important decision was also made that the innovative “Desired Future Character Statements” should be part of the statutory controls. Thus there would be an integration of strategic and statutory approaches in the City Plan. This was then supported by the Interdepartmental Plan Review Committee and by Daunt as it did not have any budgetary implications for State departments which had been the major sticking point with legislating for the whole Plan (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 35:36, Sydney, 23 October 2007). Blencowe recalls the compromise worked out to give legislative status to only the statutory components of the City Plan was still strenuously opposed in the Review Committee by Hart, but she remembers (Blencowe, Sybella, ohi 21 / 60:63, Adelaide, 15 November 2007):

At one meeting of the committee Ramsay said ‘The dogs are barking in Adelaide – there is going to be a separate Act’ – and there was.

Mant (1982, p.74) argues development control legislation should be limited to that purpose, it is a tool of planning – it is not planning. Landowners should have a reasonable certainty as to what they can and cannot do on their land in terms of the legislative controls. Setting the development control rules needs to be separate from the application of these rules to a particular development. Lloyd-Jones contends the separate legislation for the City was introduced ‘over Hart’s dead body’, but it did put in place a joint new body as the successor to the CADC (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 45:51, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007). The CADC had a continuing strategic and statutory role during the period of negotiation particularly in relation to development projects; details of these are in Appendix 22.
Roche recalls that Hudson had made it clear the State was not going to legislate for the ACC’s whole City Plan. Mant used his influence to persuade Dunstan and Hudson there was a need for separate legislation but based on the important decision to separate out the “Principles of Development Control” which would be statutory and control the private sector. “Planning” the City would continue as a strategic political process (Roche, John, oh 4 / 39:45, North Adelaide 17 April 2007). While State Cabinet had opposed legislation for the implementation of a City Plan which consisted of over a hundred policies, some of which imposed quite onerous financial and other obligations on the State, it was comfortable with the new course of action recommended by Hudson. State Cabinet decided to:

- instruct the Parliamentary Counsel to draft the necessary legislation
- recommend which provisions of the Plan dealing with development control would necessarily require legislation
- recommend the necessary action to be taken with regard to those provisions of the Plan not requiring legislation
- ensure that the State Government would be able to conform to the Desired Future Character Statements of Precincts
- ensure the State Government’s interests and policies would not be impeded
- draft the necessary Regulations.

It was Roche’s task, as the Lord Mayor, to use his influence and persuade the other members of the ACC, particularly Bowen, Chappel and Hayes, that while there would be separate legislation for the City it would not authorise the whole City Plan (as the Council wanted) but only the statutory components. However, the governance of the City would continue with a new joint City/State body, the City of Adelaide Planning Commission (CAPC) to succeed the CADC.

With the establishment of the innovative CADC in 1972 there had been an integration of strategic and statutory approaches to planning the City of Adelaide. It has been argued in this Section that planning innovation and difference continued through the political influence of Hudson and Roche and the administrative influence of Mant and the researcher. This entailed separate planning and development control legislation for the City which is examined in the next Section.

106 Adelaide City Archives. City Planner’s Department, Accession No. 4361, File D 3429.
Mant & Llewellyn-Smith (1978, p.62) assert legislation was only required to authorise the “Principles of Development Control” for the City. This Section examines the nature of the legislation that was enacted.

Wagner (Wagner, Geoff, ohi 19 / 105:110, Burnside, 7 November 2007) recalls that while Mant had provided the instructions for a Bill for a separate Act for the City it was Bob Daugherty (the Parliamentary Counsel), Bowering and himself who had done the detailed work. Daugherty’s advice was that every piece of legislation needed to be written to be prescriptive and the legislator’s intent was clear. But every time there was a prescription the circumstances under which it could be broken needed to be provided. This is the trade-off between certainty and flexibility; you cannot expect to get it right all the time and thus an escape clause is needed. Wagner (Wagner, Geoff, ohi 19 / 111:112, Burnside, 7 November 2007) observes:

Daugherty had been quite challenged to draft such an unconventional piece of legislation for something which was so innovative and had never been done before.

Blencowe also had discussions with Daugherty and provided advice on the separate legislation as he had serious reservations about what could be legislated. Daugherty wanted precision which was not what was intended with the new proposed approach of General Principles and Desired Future Character Statements. The existing planning legislation was quite straightforward and he foresaw challenges to a planning authority having to make discretionary judgements as to whether or not an application was consistent with a Desired Future Character Statement or affect the amenity of an area. But Mant and Daugherty finally agreed on a draft Bill which went to Parliament and, after some amendments, became the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 (Blencowe, Sybella, ohi 21 / 51: 73, Adelaide, 15 November 2007).

Brian Hayes QC was briefed to draft the Regulations under the Act. Hayes recalls there had been a case over subdivision in the City of Marion which had gone all the way to the Privy Council in the UK. Hudson had made it clear to Hayes he did not want to have any matter in the City which could end up in the Privy Council. He was also opposed to any third party appeal rights and the ACC did not want subdivision control. Hayes understood why Hart was opposed to separate legislation for the City as Hart believed what was wanted could be accommodated within the Planning and Development Act, 1966-72. However, in Hayes’ opinion this Act could be not amended to incorporate the special requirements of the City (Hayes, Brian, ohi 46 / 9:31, Adelaide, 12 May 2008).
The *Principles of Development Control* (previously the statutory policies) were adopted by the Council on 18 October 1976 and signed jointly by the Lord Mayor, representing the ACC, and the Minister for Planning, representing the State, on 21 October 1976. On the same day the State introduced a Bill for the City’s innovative separate legislation into the House of Assembly where Dunstan ensured it passed (SA Government *Hansard*, 21 October 1976, p. 1754).

To ensure the passage of the Bill through the Legislative Council, Roche and the researcher sat in the Speaker’s Gallery during every debate and were available to brief the Legislative Councillors as and when required on each clause of the Bill. The ACC was still able to exercise its usual influence in this arena, particularly though Murray Hill MLC who was a former City Councillor and long time friend of Roche. The Legislative Council was mainly concerned about the appeal provisions. The Bill provided that the Minister of Planning would have been the ultimate authority in determining appeals by aggrieved applicants. The Legislative Council amended this so that a new City of Adelaide Appeals Tribunal was established consisting of a single Judge of the existing Planning Appeals Board. The State accepted this amendment and the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act* which was different to any other planning legislation in Australia was assented to on 16 December 1976 and came into operation on 1 March 1977.

Hopgood contends the State was proud it had legislation which was unique in relation to capital cities which the other States did not have. He recalls going to Planning Ministers’ conferences where he was often asked by the other Ministers how South Australia had managed to organise this. Hopgood had always replied it was all about good governance (Hopgood, Don, ohi 26 / 10:13, Morphett Vale, 18 February 2008).

Mant & Llewellyn-Smith (1978, p.63) state the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976* illustrates three very important points:

- Planning Principles are value judgements which should be seen to be made by Governments and not independent bodies or the judiciary.
- Planning Principles are generalisations which the community, through its governments, makes concerning the appropriate distribution of resources.
- Planning Principles should be expressed in qualitative terms rather than purely mathematical or one-dimensional terms and against this view of the future, individual development applications can be judged.
The Principles of Development Control needed to be supported by more detailed Regulations. Regulations covering definitions, fees, development zones and use groups were gazetted on 24 February 1977 and came into effect on the Appointed Day, 1 March 1977. A further Regulation covering density, with basic and maximum plot ratios specified, was gazetted on 23 June 1977.

In this Section the influences behind the separate legislation, which provided for statutory controls in the City, have been identified. In the next Section the nature of the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 which integrated strategic and statutory approaches is examined.

3.1.12 THE CITY OF ADELAIDE PLAN 1976–81

The City of Adelaide Plan 1976–1981 is examined and analysed in this Section. It was published on 30 June 1977 in the same format as the Planning Study. The Council quite deliberately chose blue as the colour for the cover. As well as providing convenient shorthand to assist the elected members (‘The Red Book’ has been superseded by ‘The Blue Book’), blue is the colour of power and authority (Kohl 1998); the Council had its own planning system. The City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 consisted of three components with the strategic and statutory elements integrated into the one document and actions to implement the Plan identified.

The City Plan consisted of:

- Book 1 - The City of Adelaide Plan comprising Objectives and Policies (the strategic elements) and the Principles (the statutory elements).
- Book 2 - The City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 and Regulations.
- Book 3 - Action Projects to implement the Plan.

Mark Hamilton, who was to become Deputy Lord Mayor, contends the first City Plan was a “cutting edge” approach to city planning at the time and Adelaide then had the most progressive planning system in Australia. This represented a model for other capital cities and indeed for other Councils in the metropolitan area. Hamilton, as a lawyer, appreciated the innovation of ‘Desired Future Character Statements’, which were word pictures giving some certainty to land uses, being included in statutory controls. The important factor was that the strategic policies and statutory development controls were integrated into one document and this was to be the case in each of the five-yearly City Plans (Hamilton, Mark, ohi 41 / 19:28, Adelaide, 9 May 2008).
Forster & McCaskill (2007, p.98) assert the City Plan sought to redefine in modern terms the heritage and urban design potential of Light’s original plan, conserving the best of the historic built environment and enhancing the potential of the physical city to accommodate new activities. The City would be managed as four Districts comprising Core, Inner Frame, Outer Frame and Residential within which there were twenty-three Precincts. It was thus different from a conventional zoning map in that specific uses were not allocated to particular sites. Innovative written statements for each Precinct expressed a desired future in terms of activity, use mixtures, building density, physical improvements and landscape character. The City Plan incorporated a set of Regulations establishing performance standards for developments in each of the Precincts with the Council retaining discretionary powers over all developments whether permitted or not.

Chris Bowe contends in the Adelaide Review (June 2004, pp. 1-5) the City Plan 1976-81 was the most innovative blueprint of its time for the growth and management of an Australian city, and possibly the world. Under the City Plan there was a new concept of Desired Future Character Statements for Precincts and constructive development conditions. It was unsurpassed as a vision and management plan. The City Plan was representative of the influence of Dunstan when innovation and intellect had its day in the sun and the governance benefits of two creative levels of government working well together were apparent.

The nature of, and views about, the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 have been examined in this Section. It came into operation on 1 March 1977 when the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 was enacted and an innovative system of Interim Development Control, exercised through an influential joint City/State body since October 1972, ceased.

3.1.13 SUMMARY

In this Chapter a core research question has been answered:

What were the important factors in the introduction of Interim Development Control for the City in October 1972?

The State had concerns about the ACC’s policies of traffic planning, car parking and urban design. The Council had problems with the statutory zoning of South Adelaide under the State’s Metropolitan Development Plan, 1962 and the transportation proposals in the MATS report. The influence of Stretton on Dunstan and Hayes brought about an unusual approach to IDC in the form of a joint
ACC/State body for the governance of the City. This enabled a Planning Study to be carried out by consultants. Clarke made a significant contribution to the planning of the City by the integration of strategic and statutory approaches. He also recommended the continuation of an ACC/State joint body and saw the political opportunity for the Council to have its own planning legislation. However, Clarke was mistaken that the State would agree to be bound by a Plan which involved significant expenditure and commitments to long term action. There was considerable negotiation both politically and administratively between the Council and State to convert the Planning Study into a City Plan that was acceptable to both parties. Roche was the right person in the right place at the right time to be an influential Lord Mayor. Hudson had a good understanding of Council and State issues and was an influential Minister of Planning who had clear objectives for the development of the City. At the administrative level, Mant and the researcher were able to reach a compromise on State and ACC positions and a different system of planning and development control was put in place with an innovative separate Act for the City. The difference between strategic and statutory approaches was recognised but they were integrated in the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81. In the CADC’s Final Report it was stated the most satisfying achievement had been the increase in residential development since its First Statement of Policy was released; the success of the CADC’s policies meant the objectives of Dunstan and Hayes for the City had been met.107

107 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 671/F, Accession no. 352.
CHAPTER 3.2

An innovative and different system of planning from 1 March 1977; governance influence, heritage and integration


3.2.1 INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter I will argue that an innovative system of planning in the City of Adelaide began on 1 March 1977 when the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 came into force. In exploring its importance I will examine the governance role of the new joint ACC/State planning body, the City of Adelaide Planning Commission; changes in the political and administrative nature of the Council and the State; and the role of key individuals (as shown in Table 3) during the period until 1982. I will also identify new issues that arose in the review of the City of Adelaide Plan 1976–81, especially as they related to heritage with the beginning of the City of Adelaide Heritage Study. Finally, I will argue that an integration of strategic and statutory planning approaches continued in the adoption of the next five-yearly Plan - the City of Adelaide Plan 1981–1986.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3 – Individuals of influence 1977 - 1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Dunstan+ Labor Premier of South Australia until 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Corcoran+ Labor Premier of South Australia during 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Tonkin+ Liberal Premier of South Australia 1979-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Hudson+ Labor Minister of Planning until 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Wotton* Liberal Minister of Environment &amp; Planning 1979-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Roche* Lord Mayor and Chairman of the CAPC until July 1977 (deceased April 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Joseph+ Lord Mayor and Chairman of the CAPC 1977-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Bowen* Lord Mayor and Chairman of the CAPC 1979-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Watson+ Lord Mayor and Chairman of the CAPC 1981-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Mant* Commissioner and Director, Department of Housing &amp; Urban Affairs until 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell Platten* Commissioner and Chief Architect &amp; Planner SAHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Phipps* Commissioner and Director, Department of Environment &amp; Planning from 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwyn Jarrott Secretary, CAPC 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Faunt* Secretary, CAPC 1977-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Lloyd-Jones* Secretary, CAPC 1980-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Llewellyn-Smith City Planner and Commissioner until December 1981, Town Clerk from 1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Signifies an interviewee + Signifies deceased
3.2.2 THE CITY OF ADELAIDE PLANNING COMMISSION

The agreement between the ACC and the State for the governance of the City under the Act contained a number of elements. The City would be managed as a series of four Districts (Core, Inner Frame, Outer frame and Residential) containing 23 Precincts (Figure 29) as recommended by Clarke in the City of Adelaide Planning Study 1974. For each Precinct there was a ‘ Desired Future Character Statement’ which was an innovative qualitative statutory control.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 211 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 29 - The City Precinct Structure
Source: ACC 1977, p.36

The Council and the Government were committed to a process of review and the adoption of a new City Plan on a five-yearly cycle with an integration of strategic and statutory approaches. There would be certainty for the community during the first three years of the operation of the Plan. After a review in years four and five, with public involvement, a new City Plan would be adopted.

The ACC would receive and process development applications from the private sector and assess them against the statutory Principles of Development Control. If a particular application did not meet
the statutory controls in some way but was considered to have merit it could only be approved with the concurrence of the joint City of Adelaide Planning Commission (CAPC).

The innovative CAPC for the governance of the City was established as the successor to the City of Adelaide Development Committee (CADC) and was in place of the Crown Review Committee recommended by Clarke in the Planning Study. The CAPC had eight members, four of whom were nominated by the ACC and four by the State. The Chairman was appointed from one of the ACC nominees and thus there was a change from the CADC in that the Lord Mayor of the day would not automatically be the Chairman of the new body. A reserve power was provided for the State. In the event of a tied vote in the CAPC on a matter, it fell to the Minister of Planning to determine and this put pressure on all Commissioners to resolve any deadlocks.

Mant, Hart, Platten and Alan Wayte (Deputy Director of Transport) were nominated by the State to the Commission. Stretton had advised the Minister that he did not wish to be appointed. Bakewell had served Dunstan’s interests well on the CADC but this role was taken up by Mant (as the new Director of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs). Platten was therefore the only State member of the former CADC who was appointed to the new body. Hart was still the Director of Planning and Chairman of the SPA and reported directly to the Minister of Planning but administratively became part of Mant’s department. Hart’s appointment was seen to reflect the need for the governance of the City to be viewed within the metropolitan context even though the ACC now had its own planning legislation. Transport remained an important area of ACC/State relations and although Derek Scrafton (Director of Transport) was not initially appointed to the CAPC, his Deputy, Wayte, was the fourth State appointee. Hart (Hart, Stuart, ohi 5 / 79:82, Springfield, 18 April 2007) having lost the battle for the City to be part of the State’s planning system, recalls:

I was appointed as one of the four State representatives on the CAPC. I did not find the meetings particularly enjoyable, and there seemed to be a tension and unease between the elected members of the Council and the State appointees.

As part of the agreement between the State and the Council at the political level between Hudson and Roche, and through their influence, the researcher was appointed as a Commissioner nominated by the ACC. When Roche succeeded Clampett as Lord Mayor and Chairman of the CADC in 1975, Hayes (former Lord Mayor) had taken up the vacant ACC position on the CADC. The three elected members nominated to the CAPC were therefore Roche (Chairman), Bowen and Hayes. Chappel, while not appointed to the CAPC, continued to represent the Council on the State Planning Authority.
The first meeting of the CAPC was held in the Council Chamber in the Town Hall on 1 March 1977, the “Appointed Day”, when the Act came into effect.\textsuperscript{108} It was attended by Hudson as the Minister for Planning with responsibility for the legislation. Hudson advised that Cabinet had made an important decision in terms of governance and the State would cooperate with the CAPC. He referred to his speech made in the House of Assembly on 21 October 1976 when the legislation was introduced. Hudson (\textit{SA Parliamentary Debates, Hansard}, 21 October 1976, p.1751) had said:

I would point out that it is the intention of the Government that, as a matter of policy, it will endeavour in its development activities to conform to the City Plan and arrangements will be made for the Commission to examine Government development proposals.\textsuperscript{109}

Mant advised the CAPC that he had been appointed as Director of a new Department of Housing and Urban Affairs and the Department was being structured on the basis of ‘place managers’. The Secretary of the Commission would therefore have a distinctive role; rather than just having a statutory function he would have a strategic responsibility for the City as a place. The first Secretary was Gwyn Jarrott who was previously Clarke’s office manager of USC.\textsuperscript{110} The Secretary would have a position of influence as he was expected to be informed about State policies as they affected the City, liaise with State and Commonwealth Departments as well as ACC officers, and ensure an integration of strategic and statutory approaches. Given Jarrott’s experience with the Planning Study he was sufficiently qualified to advise the Minister of a development application lodged with the ACC which might be of importance to the State (Mant & Llewellyn-Smith 1978, p.63). In another innovation the Council provided an office for the Secretary in the Town Hall; thus he was in a position to comprehend the totality of government policies and programs relating to the governance of the City. Mant contends this was very important as the Secretary could liaise with the ACC staff and keep the State informed. Some planning staff in the State opposed this, but Mant saw it as a coup as there was a State employee based in the Town Hall who had the ability to inform the Director what was actually going on in the City – Adelaide was different and no other head of a State planning agency in Australia had such an ability (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 80:92, Sydney, 23 October, 2007). Mant reflects on the initial membership of the CAPC which he thinks was an excellent group of people and an institution very typical of Adelaide. He liked it because of its innovative role in governance which was so different to the planning situation in Sydney.

\textsuperscript{108} As 1 March was St David’s Day, Roche marked the occasion of the ACC having its own system of planning and development control by flying the Red Dragon of Wales outside the Town Hall instead of the ACC flag.
\textsuperscript{109} State Records. CAPC Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
\textsuperscript{110} Jarrott was identified in the list of 65 potential interviewees but the researcher was unable to trace him.
Mant (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 8:41, Sydney, 23 October 2007) observes:

I was dealing with reasonable people of influence who I could talk to in an open way. In Adelaide you could come up with a good idea and people would see how it could be brought about.

The Secretary of the CAPC (Jarrott) was requested to prepare a paper on the governance role of the CAPC, particularly for the benefit of the State Commissioners Hart and Wayte who had not previously been involved in the CADC or the Planning Study. \(^{111}\) Jarrott, clearly under the influence of his Departmental Head (Mant), concluded:

- the CAPC’s statutory role was defined in the legislation
- joint action at intergovernmental level would be essential if policies are to be defined having regard to local and wider community objectives
- positive initiatives must be taken in areas where cooperative action between the various levels of government and the private sector are necessary to achieve desirable community objectives
- planning legislation should reduce excessive legality and provide a degree of certainty but with maximum flexibility
- development control can only be seen as one tool of good planning. \(^{112}\)

While the Crown was not bound by the Act in an important decision the Cabinet had agreed that applications by the State would be referred to the CAPC as Hudson had advised. Bakewell continued to exert influence and directed all State Departments and agencies that:

- In the preliminary planning of a proposed project, regard should be had to the Principles of Development Control and Regulations provided under the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976.
- Following approval in principle of the proposed project by Cabinet, the responsible Minister or the Board of a Statutory Authority, the proposal should be referred to the CAPC for any comment it may wish to make.
- Any comments of the CAPC will be considered by Cabinet, the responsible Minister or the Statutory Board before approval to proceed with implementation of the project is given. \(^{113}\)

To reinforce Bakewell’s advice, Roche wrote to 15 relevant State Departments and agencies advising them of the need to consult with the CAPC. However, there was no such provision for development proposals by the Commonwealth Government. Roche therefore wrote to the Liberal Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, requesting that the Commonwealth comply with the provisions of the City Plan even

\(^{111}\) State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 6 April 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
\(^{112}\) State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 4 May 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
\(^{113}\) State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 1 March 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
though the Commonwealth could not be bound by the State legislation. The status of the City of Adelaide Plan was enhanced when Roche (who had used his influence within the Liberal Party) advised the CAPC that the Prime Minister had unexpectedly replied that the Commonwealth would cooperate with the Planning Commission. Thus Adelaide was different from the other capital cities in Australia in that Commonwealth Departments would submit development proposals in the City for consideration and comment, but not for formal approval, by the Planning Commission.¹¹⁴

Hayes (Hayes, Brian, ohi 46 / 90:95, Adelaide, 12 May, 2008) contends there was a need for a body such as the CAPC in Adelaide in the 1970s. Besides being responsible for integrating policy between two levels of government it had a statutory role. The CAPC was able to negotiate agreements and there was a better understanding of the issues from both the State and ACC with a degree of goodwill. While it was a sensible protocol applications from the Crown were considered by the CAPC and there were no binding decisions, Hayes (ibid, 46 /96:97) observes:

It is always a nightmare for Governments to have independent decision-making bodies as ultimately Ministers want to be in control.

Judith Brine who was later to become a Commissioner, contends that city planning is really an integration of strategic and statutory planning components (Brine, Judith, ohi 42 / 67:72, Adelaide, 5 May 2008). Brine believes the State should be better at the strategic level looking at the bigger picture but she also considers councils have expertise at the local level in terms of assessing development applications against statutory requirements. A joint body, such as the CAPC, was therefore a very useful device to bring these two aspects together. McPhail (McPhail, Ian, ohi 34 / 75:77, Melbourne, 17 April 2008) asserts the CAPC was a powerful body with considerable influence in the governance of the City.

Mant admits the influence he brought to his approach to planning in Adelaide reflected his two views about public administration. The first was his experience working with the National Capital Development Commission (NCDC). Because of the way different groups of experts were employed, it was not possible for anyone to be responsible for the outcome of a ‘place’. When Mant worked in the Department of Urban and Regional Development (DURD) the concept of a ‘place manager’ emerged – a commonwealth employee being physically located in a local government area with responsibility for negotiating activities with a number of councils. The second came from dealing with difficult inter-governmental relations in DURD. Mant therefore formulated the concept of a ‘marble cake’ approach

¹¹⁴ State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 4 May 1977. Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
rather than a ‘layer cake’ approach. Lawyers tend to think of the distribution of powers in exact terms. One layer of power is responsible for ‘X’ and another layer responsible for ‘Y’. But a ‘marble cake’ approach recognises that an exact allocation of powers does not always reflect the reality of a situation. The CAPC demonstrated a ‘marble cake’ approach in several ways and it was an institution that enabled the right mix of powers to be used for the issue at hand (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 66:79, Sydney, 23 October, 2007).

This Section has examined the establishment of the joint Council/State City of Adelaide Planning Commission. It has been argued it was an innovative and different approach to the governance of the City as the Commission was in a unique position to have a comprehensive understanding of all government policies and programmes as they affected the City, including the ability to comment on proposals by the Commonwealth. In the next Section the role of the Council and its contribution to the City’s planning system will be analysed.

3.2.3 THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL IN THE NEW SYSTEM OF PLANNING

This Section reviews the Council’s commitment to the new planning system through the establishment of the City Planner’s Department in 1974. It was located in Queen’s Chambers (which is a heritage building at the rear of the Town Hall). A substantial budget was provided for the new Department because of the demands of a different planning system and the extent of the Action Project programme to implement the City Plan. The Department was structured to reflect an integration of strategic and statutory planning and the importance of implementation. There were three professional sections and supporting staff. Madigan was appointed as the Principal Planner responsible for strategic planning and research; Wagner as the Principal Planner responsible for statutory planning and development control, and Horner as the Principal Planner responsible for implementation through the Action Project programme. All of the staff in Horner’s section were qualified architect/planners who were also able to provide advice on heritage, and offer urban design advice on development applications to the statutory section.

Michael Lennon who was later to lead the State Planning Review (1992), considers that in the early 1970s the ACC had a higher level of planning expertise than the State (Lennon, Michael, ohi 35 / 107:109, Melbourne, 18 April 2008). The different approach to city planning through an integration of strategic and statutory planning in the City was seen as a potential model for other councils. McPhail
McPhail, Ian, ohi 34 / 78:80, Melbourne, 17 April 2008) asserts the best professional planners were employed in the ACC and the City’s planning system was of high quality compared to the rest of the State.

Roche provided leadership for the ACC and the CAPC while the distinctive system of planning for the City was established. As there were no third party appeal rights, Roche used his influence to bring about an innovation that the North Adelaide Society and the Adelaide Residents’ Association could provide comments on development applications. Any comments received on applications were incorporated into the reports of the City Planner’s Department. Thus community views as well as professional advice were available to the committee of elected members when development applications were assessed.

Applicants and their architects were strongly encouraged to discuss their proposed applications with staff in the City Planner’s Department before lodging a formal application. This innovation in development control proved invaluable and there was confidence in the system. It was very rare for a recommendation from the Department to be changed in the committee regarding the assessment of a development application. This meant that elected members were not “lobbied” about applications and there was a considerable amount of delegation for minor applications to the staff. The City Planner was personally involved in any major application; in dealing with design issues it was useful for the researcher to have qualifications and experience in architecture as well as city planning. Thus influence could be exerted in negotiations with architects to achieve outcomes that would comply with the discretionary statutory provisions of the City Plan.

The Council understood that the strategic Objectives and Policies would not be achieved by the statutory controls alone and that positive action to implement the Plan was also required. The Action Project programme for 1976/77 was adopted in July 1976 and work began on the projects once the different planning system was in place in March 1977. The initial list of Action Projects recommended in Clarke’s Planning Study was refined so that a Council Action Project had to have identifiable recommendations and outcomes. Some Action Projects became Action Programmes which were ongoing work tasks to elaborate and implement the strategic Objectives and Policies of the City Plan. Some Action Projects became Research Studies with a strategic focus to assist in the formulation and review of planning policy.
As part of the Streetscape Action Project the ACC undertook improvement schemes in North Adelaide and in the south-east of South Adelaide. These were developed by joint teams from the City Engineer’s Department, the Department of Parks and Recreation and the City Planner’s Department under the direction of Currie (Deputy City Planner). These schemes helped to make living conditions more attractive while at the same time they stimulated residential investment. The North Adelaide Village Centre provided a long needed community focus and improved shopping facilities. An office and residential complex was developed on Wakefield Street on land bought by Bubb for the Frome Street extension. Commercial land was developed by the private sector on the northern Wakefield Street frontage and the southern land was sold to the SAHT on a subsidised basis in return for high quality design of the public housing. This was negotiated by Platten, as the Chief Architect and Planner of SAHT, and the City Planner. As Commissioners, Platten and the researcher were able to use their influence to guide the approval process of the commercial and residential development through the CAPC. Following the opening of the Rundle Mall car park, on-street parking was removed from the northern quadrants of Hindmarsh Square and the area was landscaped as part of City Squares Action Project. A site in Topham Street was given priority for a new car park as part of the Parking Action programme (CCoA 1977, p.121).

The Action Project for the proposed Register of Places of Environmental Significance was a contentious heritage issue in both the Planning Study and draft City Plan as previously discussed. The State had excluded any heritage powers from the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 on the basis it intended to introduce state-wide legislation for preservation and conservation (CCoA 1977, p.107) and this will be discussed later in this Chapter.

The ACC’s contribution to both the strategic and statutory elements of the new planning system in the City has been reviewed in this Section. In the next Section actions to achieve strategic Objectives and Policies and implement the City Plan will be examined.

3.2.4 THE CAPC’S ROLE IN IMPLEMENTING THE CITY PLAN

The implementation of the City Plan through the governance role of the CAPC will be examined in this Section. The meeting of the CAPC in June 1977 was the last one attended by Roche as he was not seeking another term as Lord Mayor. Roche was thanked for his considerable influence on planning in the City though his membership of the CADC, as the Lord Mayor and leader of the Council, for
negotiating the *Principles of Development Control* with Minister Hudson, as the first Chairman of the CAPC, and for influencing Fraser that Commonwealth proposals would be submitted to the CAPC. Lawyer George Joseph, the senior Alderman, was elected unopposed as Lord Mayor in July and was appointed as the new Chairman of the CAPC but he had no background in city planning. At this time Hayes resigned as a Commissioner and was replaced by Chappel.

Alan Faunt followed Jarrott as Secretary of the CAPC. Faunt recalls his first meeting with Joseph was held over coffee at the ‘Flash Gelati’ café in Hindley Street where Joseph regularly met with property developers known to him. Faunt (Faunt, Alan, ohi 38 / 09:18, Adelaide, 1 May 2008) remembers briefing Joseph about the roles of the CAPC in the following terms:

> Its statutory function was to act as the development control authority for applications by the Council. It had a concurring role for applications by the private sector which the Council supported but which exceeded some of the provisions of the City Plan. It also acted as the de facto authority for applications by the State Government in the City in terms of a protocol agreed between the City and State. This was important as there was a lot of capital investment in the City by the State Government at the time.

Joseph’s approach was to be inclusive and at his first meeting he used his influence as the new Chairman to persuade the CAPC to invite representatives of State Departments to attend and thus better understand the City Plan and the role of the CAPC. Joseph also persuaded the Council to agree to the services of the City Planner’s Department being made available to the CAPC to provide professional advice on proposals by the State and the Commonwealth Government.115

At the August meeting the CAPC considered the Action Projects to implement the City Plan then identified by the ACC. In terms of governance, a number required liaison and cooperation with the State; ten required direct cooperation, two required State involvement through the CAPC, and eight were the prime responsibility of State Departments.116

Agendas of the CAPC were structured to reflect the integration of strategic and statutory planning and the importance of implementation. Thus there were three sections in the Agendas - policy (strategic) decisions; development control (statutory) decisions; and project involvement through the Action Planning programme. The role of the Secretary and his ability to liaise directly with staff of the City
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115 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 2 July 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
116 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 3 August 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
Planner’s Department was seen as critical to the way in which items were brought before the CAPC for consideration.117

The Commonwealth owned the whole of the land between Currie Street, Topham Street and Waymouth Street and it was used as an open lot car park. The Commonwealth proposed a new Commonwealth Centre on Currie Street and the ACC bought the balance of the land for a new car parking structure. At its October meeting the CAPC established criteria for the ACC’s development, over which it had statutory control, and for the Commonwealth development, on which it could only comment. This is good example of the overall governance role the Planning Commission played in planning the City.118

The CAPC also had an important governance role to play regarding the Park Lands and the heritage of Light’s Plan. The State had alienated Park Lands over time for a variety of uses as described in earlier Chapters. As part of the new joint cooperative approach to planning the City the Engineering and Water Supply Department (E&WS) proposed the demolition of a pump station in the south-east Park Lands with the area to be returned to Park Lands and this proposal was supported by the CAPC.119 The Commission also supported the demolition of the E&WS Kent Town Depot on Dequetteville Terrace (where 500 people were employed) with this area returned to Park Lands. However, the valve house on the site was retained and restored because of its heritage value. This action was completed in 1981.120

A major traffic issue was the ACC’s proposed trial closure of Beaumont Road between South Terrace and Greenhill Road. The objective was to assist the residential redevelopment of the south east of the City by eliminating traffic entering the City from the eastern suburbs by this route. This was a contentious issue with the adjoining Burnside City Council but was seen as critical by the ACC in terms of its residential programme. The CAPC agreed to support the proposal at its December meeting and Beaumont Road was eventually closed which had an immediate effect on the desirability of living in the south-east of the City because there was no more through traffic.121

117 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 6 September 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
118 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 5 October 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
119 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 2 November 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
120 Adelaide City Archives. See Minutes of ACC meeting 27 October 1981, p.73.
121 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 7 December 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
Bakewell (in his capacity as Deputy Chair of the State Government Insurance Commission [SGIC]) briefed the CAPC about the proposal for a new building in Victoria Square. The CAPC was keen to see a range of development options and authorised Commissioners Platten and Chappel to liaise with the SGIC architects. This was later to become a highly political application in terms of the new *South Australian Heritage Act, 1978*. This legislation was enacted with bi-partisan support in the Parliament to conserve items of State significance. A South Australian Heritage Committee (SAHC) was established to advise the relevant Minister on items to be placed on the Register of State Heritage Items (Mosler 2006, p.4). The twelve members were representative of building, real estate and heritage professionals. Their main role was to represent the views of the public on heritage matters. The Act amended the *Planning and Development Act, 1969* but as the City was excluded from this legislation it was necessary to amend the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976* and a new Section 24 was added. This required a new Principle for heritage and P31 was adopted through the legislative process of the ACC referring it to the CAPC; the CAPC’s decision being reported to the Minister; Cabinet adopting the Minister’s recommendation, and the Governor gazetting the new heritage Principle for the City. Faunt (Faunt, Alan, ohi 38 / 09:18, Adelaide, 1 May 2008) contends that heritage was a major issue between the ACC and the State in the early days of the Planning Commission.

As previously mentioned in Chapter 3.1, Ruthven Mansions in Pulteney Street had been saved from demolition by the intervention and influence of Hayes with Dunstan but it had remained vacant and continued to deteriorate. A proposal by the State Public Buildings Department to demolish Ruthven Mansions was considered by the CAPC at its May 1978 meeting. The CAPC refused to support the demolition and sought further assistance from Dunstan so that the Mansions could be restored to residential use. Dunstan agreed and later a developer (with Chappel as the architect) restored the building as part of a larger development and the residential apartments sold without difficulty (Figure 30). The CAPC also influenced the ACC to extend its residential rate rebate to all City properties as it considered there was no justification for the bias against landlords and tenants compared to owner occupiers.122

Hudson and Mant approached Hart about whether Hart would be prepared to be seconded from his position of Director of Planning and undertake an *Inquiry into the Control of Private Development*. After appropriate terms had been discussed Hart agreed and he was given a commission to carry out

---

122 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 3 May 1978, Box GRS 4083/00001/02.
the Inquiry. Hart states (Hart, Stuart, oh 5 / 71:94, Springfield, 18 April 2007) that he enjoyed being free of administrative duties and his initial report was submitted to the Minister in 1978. Supplementary papers were consequently prepared which all contributed to the preparation of new State planning legislation in 1982 but, as will be discussed, this did not apply to the City and thus the Council retained its separate system.

Figure 30 – Ruthven Mansions; saved from demolition and restored
Source: Researcher

In June, as part of its governance role, the CAPC considered joint Projects and Programmes for 1978/79. The ACC had suggested Victoria Square (AP2); The Yards – Joie de Vivre (AP11); Adelaide Railway Station (AP13); City and Metropolitan Movement Programme; Central City Parking Programme; After School Care Programme, and the Illumination of Buildings Programme. However, when the CAPC considered a list of 20 possibilities suggested by the Secretary, including those put forward by the ACC, only seven studies were selected. The studies chosen by the CAPC were:

S1  The Yards – Joie de Vivre (AP11)
S6  Low Rent Boarding and Lodging Accommodation
S12 Parking Policies (Department of Transport)
S13 After School Child Care (Department of Education)
S14 Effects of statutory charges on new residential development (Department of Housing and Urban Affairs)
S15 Illumination of buildings (Department of the Premier)
S16 Valuation of heritage buildings (Department of Lands)
In relation to the Parking Policies Study (S12) a Central City Working Group was appointed by the CAPC comprising Wayte (Department of Transport and a Commissioner), Bruce Thompson (State Planning Office), Andrew Lothian (Department of the Environment) and the City Planner (also a Commissioner). The Terms of Reference of this Group were to determine joint ACC/State policies for the City having regard to the demands for short and long term parking and the future of public transport and to advise the Planning Commission in accordance with its governance role.  

As mentioned earlier, Bakewell had briefed the CAPC about an application by the SGIC for a new commercial building on the corner of Victoria Square and Grote Street. In the middle of the site was the Marine and Harbours’ building whose façade and an internal staircase were on the new State Heritage List. The SGIC had appointed a local architect best known as a ‘commercial architect’ and the CAPC was concerned about the design of the building and the implications for the heritage façade in this prominent location in the City. It was a contentious heritage issue that a State agency was proposing the demolition of a State listed item. Faunt (Faunt, Alan, ohi 38 / 40:41, Adelaide, 1 May 2008) recalls the Chairman of the SGIC (Lance Milne) rang him and advised he had “the answer to a maiden’s prayer”. The proposal was to physically move the façade of the heritage item to the northern end of the site, thus freeing up the remainder of the site for the commercial development. The SGIC was advised by Faunt that this proposal was unlikely to be supported by the CAPC. The Commission maintained its view that it was not an acceptable proposal for a heritage item and it should be possible to integrate the façade into the design of the new building. Dunstan then invited Platten (but not Chappel), to prepare a scheme which included keeping the façade. Platten was given eight weeks and technical support from the SAHT. This was an unusual and different approach as it was really a case of ‘hands on’ work by a development control authority. The Platten scheme was lodged with the Premier but nothing was heard for several weeks. Faunt was then requested to arrange for all the Commissioners to be present at a meeting with Dunstan. When they arrived at the Cabinet Board Room there were two models, one with the façade retained in the middle of the site and one with the façade moved to the northern end of the site. The CAPC viewed the two models and discussed their respective merits for about 15 minutes. Dunstan entered the room and thanked the Commissioners for coming and looking at the two models. Then he said:

   I’m sure that you will all agree with me that the scheme which moves the façade of the Marine and Harbours’ building to the northern end of the site is the best solution.

\[123\] State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 4 June 1978, Box GRS 4083/00001/02.
All the Commissioners (including the researcher) nodded politely and with no further discussion the Premier left. Faunt was directed to record this meeting as a formal meeting of the CAPC with a decision to approve the application. Dunstan had exerted his considerable influence and this is how the scheme which is in existence (Figure 31) came to be built (Faunt, Alan, ohi 38 / 29:38, Adelaide, 1 May 2008).

![Figure 31 – Relocated façade of the Marine and Harbours’ Building (with the new commercial building to the left)](image)

Source: Researcher

One application which divided the CAPC on Council and State lines was the ACC’s proposal to demolish the former Pirie Street Methodist Church and Meeting Hall and build a new administrative centre. While there was support for the demolition of the former Church there was concern about the heritage value of the Old Meeting Hall from State members. At the CAPC meeting in July 1978 four voted in favour of the demolition (ACC) and four voted against the demolition (State). In terms of the Act as there was a tied vote the matter was referred to the Minister for Planning for his determination. The Minister subsequently refused the Council’s application to demolish the Old Meeting Hall.

The ACC decided to proceed with the new building in Pirie Street and reluctantly restored the Hall. It was somewhat ironic that upon demolition of the former Church, it was discovered that the Hall had actually been added to the Church as the Hall only had three sides and thus it was the Church itself which was the earlier building. The Council subsequently decided to build the northern wall of the Hall in character with the remaining three walls and the Hall now appears as a restored complete entity (Figure 32).
In this Section the Planning Commission’s role in actions to implement the City Plan has been identified. Political and administrative changes were occurring within the Council which led to different individuals having influence and this is examined in the next Section.

3.2.5 DIFFERENT INFLUENCES RESULTING FROM CHANGES WITHIN THE COUNCIL

Hayes had instituted the policy that the Lord Mayor would only serve two one-year terms and that the senior Alderman became the next Lord Mayor. The impact of this policy and the changes which resulted are reviewed in this Section. The Lord Mayor of the day enjoyed the support of the rest of the elected members of the Council during a limited term of office. Thus when Joseph tried for a third year in 1979 he was beaten by Bowen who was then the senior Alderman. Bowen had the support of the other elected members and, as a member of The Adelaide Club, the support of the establishment. Bowen was also appointed as the Chairman of the CAPC.

Ian McPhail came to South Australia in 1979 as Director of the Office of Local Government. McPhail recalls the one thing that was impressed on him by Bowen when McPhail arrived was the ‘Olympian and separate status of the ACC’. The ACC had retained the position of Aldermen as well as Councillors, and had its own planning legislation. McPhail wondered why was there such a piece of legislation which created a hole in the centre of the metropolitan plan. While this was a valid question, there were no pressures within the State to change the situation. It was just part of the
structure of the City, clearly defined by the heritage of Light’s Park Lands which acted like a *cordon sanitaire*. Thus there could be a different approach to governance in the City compared to the rest of the metropolitan area without it being a problem. However, McPhail contends the City’s separate status meant it could be resistant to social issues, including housing, transport and accessibility (McPhail, Ian, ohi 34 / 40:54, Melbourne, 18 April, 2008).

The City Planner was invited to present a paper to the 7th East Asia Region Organisation of Planning and Housing (EAROPH) conference in Kuala Lumpur in 1980. The title of the paper was “The City of Adelaide Plan: inception, legislation and implementation”. The ACC decided that Bowen should accompany the researcher to the conference and this provided an opportunity to informally discuss Bowen’s views about the City’s heritage and the influence he was likely to have. Faunt recalls he had to develop a working relationship with Bowen in Bowen’s capacity as the new Chairman of the CAPC. An early issue to be addressed by the CAPC was a State proposal for a new Remand Centre at a site on Port Road in the suburb of Hindmarsh. Bowen considered the facility should be in the City and he used his influence with the relevant Minister to change the site for the proposal. Thus the Remand Centre was built at the western end of Currie Street in the City after support for this site by the CAPC (Faunt, Alan, ohi 38 / 39:72, Adelaide, 1 May 2008).

Arland had a difficult relationship with Hayes as discussed in Chapter 2.3. Arland’s relationship with Bowen was equally difficult and Arland retired as Town Clerk in early 1980. With influence from Bowen the Council appointed Jack Measday as the new Town Clerk on a five year contract with effect from 1 August 1980. Measday was a qualified Engineer with a Town Clerk’s Certificate and an Associate Diploma in Town Planning. David Moncrieff wrote in *The Advertiser* (1 July 1980, p.17) that Measday had previously been the City Engineer of Unley but most of his professional life had been in the private sector and he had retired as the CEO of [Boral] Quarry Industries.

The ACC Commercial Manager also retired. Bowen again influenced the Council to create a new Department with an upgraded position of Commercial Director. Barry Finch, an architect from Sydney, was appointed and he brought a new perspective to the development of the City. In his first report to the ACC in September 1980, he recommended a Marketing Plan for the City in terms of both residential and commercial development. Finch’s view of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81* was that it was just another obstacle to overcome, and that its review should be progressive with any policy or

---

124 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 6346.
constraint which could be considered negative, removed. Finch stressed the importance of speed and freedom of decision with as few people as possible involved and any unnecessary constraints eliminated. He wanted 'sell' the City as a place to live and do business.

Arland had a protocol that Heads of Departments sorted out their differences before reports went before elected members so that different administrative views were not aired in committees. However, Measday had a different approach and allowed Finch’s report to go forward despite the City Planner’s concerns about how the elected members would see the review of the City Plan if the new Commercial Director saw the Plan as an obstacle to development.

The City Planner recognised the politics of this situation and reported to the ACC in December 1980 about the nature of the current statutory controls and the perceived problems with them. It was noted the City’s different system used all three available instruments of development control. These were:

1. Principles were used to control height and usable landscaped space
2. Regulations were used to control density and land-use
3. Policy Guidelines were used to guide decisions about signs, parking and air-conditioning.

It was suggested *inter alia* in the report to the Council:

1. the development control system could be perceived as restrictive and some greater flexibility was required
2. there was insufficient control over some uses of land due to the lack of distinction made between effectively dissimilar, though apparently related, uses in the same Development Group in the Regulations (e.g. local hotels and hotels with entertainment)
3. many of the ACC’s policies used in decision-making on development applications (e.g. commercial signs) were non-statutory
4. changes were required to the Act to allow temporary approvals and home activities to be granted to a person rather than to the land.

The City Planner argued in the report the first review of the City Plan should be revisionary rather than revolutionary as was being suggested by the Commercial Director. It should update the existing system which had widespread State and community support. It was further argued that it would be in the best interests of the Council to maintain its innovative and different system in the City, compared to that controlled by the SPA in the rest of the State. There was a risk the special governance
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arrangements for the City would be lost but the benefits of the City’s separate system needed to be better explained if there was a perception the City Plan was an obstacle to development. The approach recommended by the City Planner was discussed at length and then endorsed by the Council; thus Finch’s proposed *laissez-faire* approach to planning the City was neutralised.126

Political and administrative changes in the Council and the influence of different individuals have been examined in this Section. In the next Section the governance implications for the City resulting from political and administrative changes in the State will be analysed.

### 3.2.6 DIFFERENT INFLUENCES RESULTING FROM CHANGES WITHIN THE STATE

Dunstan resigned unexpectedly on 2 February 1979 due to ill health and thus the considerable influence he had exercised for a decade ceased. His resignation resulted in changes in the State which will be examined in this Section. Combe (2009 p.96) asserts when Dunstan’s Deputy, Des Corcoran, became Premier, Corcoran put his personal stamp on Cabinet and then called an early election for September 1979. The Liberal party won the election and David Tonkin became Premier. There were subsequently significant changes to the upper and middle levels of the public service with re-organised Departments. Corcoran stepped down as Leader of the ALP and John Bannon became Leader of the Opposition (ibid, p. 99). Linn (2006, p.257) asserts Dunstan could be credited with the return of residential population to the City and that he also raised public awareness about the heritage of the City.

With a change of State Government Mant offered his resignation as Director of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs but he stayed on for a couple of months under the new Minister for Environment and Planning, David Wotton, until a new Departmental Head was appointed (Mant, John, ohi 15 / 94:95, Sydney, 23 October 2007).

Wotton recalls that one of his first tasks as a new Minister was to represent the State and address the ACC as part of the traditional Colonel Light ceremony in the Town Hall (as referred to in Chapter 2.1 and Appendix 9). He was bombarded by members on all sides of the Liberal Party who had greater experience with local government regarding what to say about governance and the ACC/State
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126 Adelaide City Archives. See Minutes of the ACC meeting 22 December 1980, p.671.
relationship as this was the first opportunity the new Government had to comment on it. In particular, Murray Hill who was the new Minister for Local Government and whom had worked closely with Roche to secure the original City legislation passed in the Legislative Council in 1976, had some strong views about the importance of the ACC. Wotton observes there were some in his party who thought Wotton did not show enough strength to do something about the City as the rezoning of south-west and south-east Adelaide in the City Plan was still seen as controversial and should not have happened. However, there was also a feeling that the City was different and the issue did not warrant the State taking on the ACC politically. Thus it was better to ‘leave sleeping dogs lie’ (Wotton, David, ohi 25 / 09:17, Stirling, 13 February 2008).

Wotton also reflects that he had regular meetings with Bowen and found these useful and amiable as they used to see eye to eye on most things. However, Wotton received mixed messages from his Department about the ACC’s separate legislation. The question of whether it was appropriate for the ACC to have its own legislation seemed to be bound up in the broader issues of heritage for which he also had responsibility. Within the Liberal Party there were ongoing discussions about the relevance of heritage legislation (Wotton, David, ohi 25 / 18:21, Stirling, 13 February 2008).

Wotton set up a Planning Advisory Committee to assist him in his role as Minister and this included such people as Roche and a property expert, Roger Cook. Their advice was particularly useful in terms of the introduction of the Planning Act, 1982. Hart was pushing to get the City back into the State system and it would have been logical for the ACC’s legislation to have been reincorporated at this time as by then there had been five years experience with the City Plan. However, Roche used his influence on the Planning Advisory Committee to ensure the City retained its separate status (Wotton, David, ohi 25 / 09:21, Stirling, 13 February 2008). Michael Lennon, who later was to become Director of the State Plan Review, observes the interests of commercial property owners were to the fore on the Planning Advisory Committee which Wotton established and they conceived the new planning Act. Lennon confirms Roche’s influence in excluding the City from this legislation (Lennon, Michael, ohi 35 / 30:34, Melbourne, 19 April, 2008).

When Mant left, Wotton appointed Ted Phipps to be the Director of a new Department of Environment and Planning. Phipps had been with the Land Commission and there was controversy within the Liberal Party about this appointment as the Party had not been great friends with the Land Commission while in Opposition. In Government, the Land Commission was abolished and the Urban Land Trust was set up in its place. Phipps was also appointed to replace Mant on the CAPC and this
highlighted the importance the State still placed on the CAPC. In Wotton’s view the significance of the CAPC was that it provided a governance mechanism for a good working relationship between the Council and the State (Wotton, David, ohi 25 / 56:61, Stirling, 13 February 2008).

However, a State project which caused controversy was the North East Area Public Transport Review (NEAPTR). Representatives of the NEAPTR Team had initially briefed the CAPC in November 1977 about the project. The options were for a freeway, buses, trams or trains in the transport corridor. Scrafton recalls the State wanted to extend the tram line through the City and was committed to the route along King William Street and through the Park Lands. The ACC was totally opposed and argued that it would only support the tram extension if it was undergrounded along King William Street and any impact on the Park Lands was minimised. This proposal was costed by the State and effectively this ‘killed the project dead in the water’ (Scrafton, Derek, ohi 43 / 25:31, Adelaide, 12 May, 2008).

In the lead up to the State election in November 1979 the Liberal Opposition announced it would scrap the idea of extending the tram and would replace it to the north east with a bus system – the O’Bahn. Dean Brown (the Shadow Minister) had seen this in Germany and when the Tonkin Government came to power, Wayte in the Transport Department, who was also a Commissioner, was responsible for implementing the O’Bahn (Blencowe, Sybella, ohi 21 / 78:83, Adelaide, 15 November 2007). With the change of Government there were technical discussions with the ACC’s engineering staff about appropriate routes for the buses in the City once they came off the dedicated bus way and, without any political interference, this was much easier to implement. Scrafton observes, in hindsight, that if the State had simply asked the ACC what it wanted in terms of the tram routes rather than being insistent on King William Street and the Park Lands, the issues probably could have been resolved within the governance mechanism of the CAPC without too much difficulty (Scrafton, Derek, ohi 43 / 29:35, Adelaide, 12 May, 2008).

Political and administrative changes in the State and the influence of key individuals on the governance of the City have been reviewed in this Section. In the next Section influences on the heritage of the City will be examined.

127 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 2 November 1977, Box GRS 4083/00001/01.
Arland was aware of Bowen’s views on heritage when Bowen became Lord Mayor and Arland was concerned at the growing politics about heritage within the Council. The influence of Bowen on the heritage of the City will be examined in this Section.

In August 1979 Arland requested a report be prepared on how best the issue of heritage might be addressed. Consequently, a joint report by Arland and the City Planner was submitted to the ACC in March 1980 suggesting a broad approach on the unique historical, social, topographical, physical and cultural characteristics of Adelaide which made it different. Chris Milne wrote in The Advertiser (25 March 1980, p.5) about Arland’s intention to define Adelaide’s character and heritage and the importance of reflecting this in the new City Plan. Arland also stressed the importance of providing financial incentives for properties that were listed.

Bowen understood the importance of governance in relation to heritage and he wrote to Wotton in September 1980 advising he intended setting up a Lord Mayor’s Heritage Advisory Committee (LOMHAC) in the interests of the City. The ACC authorised the City Planner to undertake a study tour to Britain and USA in October and November 1980 to discuss different approaches to heritage in a range of cities. The subsequent report to the ACC in March 1981 recommended that professionals be engaged to draft a list and then an eminent independent body evaluate the list and make recommendations to the ACC to achieve a desirable outcome. This innovative approach was adopted and on 27 April 1981 the ACC appointed Donovan Marsden & Stark (DMS) to undertake the historical analysis (at a cost of $23,000). Ian Miller (an architect/planner with Pak-Poy), Stephen Williams (an economist/planner with Hassells), Ross Bateup (an architect/planner with Kinhill) and Howard Murton (an environmental consultant with Lester Firth Murton) were jointly engaged to do an initial building inventory (at a cost of $4,000).

As an example of good governance, and through Bowen’s influence with Wotton, the State gave the ACC a grant of $35,000 towards the overall cost of the study of the City’s heritage. Bowen sent a
Lord Mayor’s letter to all residents and ratepayers of the City advising a Heritage Study was to be carried out by DMS.133

Marsden & Nicol (1990, p.36) comment that Bowen wanted certainty for developers when he established LOMHAC. The members of LOMHAC134 are shown in Table 4 and its role is discussed in Section 3.3.4. Bowen saw the establishment of LOMHAC as the means of resolving the growing heritage debate. Buildings on a Heritage Register would be protected, but all unlisted places would be available for development if the proposal technically complied with the statutory provisions of the City Plan.135

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE 4 – Members of the Lord Mayor’s Heritage Advisory Committee</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jim Bowen</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Chappel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roger Cook</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Cooper</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geoffrey Dutton</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ray Harrison</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jack McConnell</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David Saunders</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alan Spry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Tregenza</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gavin Walkley</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Watson</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derek Whitelock</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mosler (2006, p.9) contends the heritage activists of the 1970s and 1980s sought to preserve the architecture of the past with its links to the communities that had formed the City for more than a century. The activists were as much interested in preserving the built manifestation of urban history as they were in preserving architectural styles. An increasingly restive community became alarmed as the Victorian and Edwardian built character of Adelaide was rapidly disappearing. Residents’ Associations and heritage groups demanded more protection while architects and developers demanded less. However, a lot of the argument about the heritage of the City was a concern about the quality of the architecture that would replace something that was known and loved. The

133 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 4688, Part 2.
134 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 7601, Part 1.
135 Bowen expressed this view to the researcher when the possible composition of LOMHAC was discussed.
commercial sector was concerned that confidence in the City would be eroded if a building not on any recognised heritage list could be affected by the actions of community groups.

Wotton considers the major issue during his term as Minister was the heritage of the City rather than more broadly based planning issues. He recalls he received a serious approach from The Adelaide Club to remove the Club from the State Heritage List but he had resisted its de-listing despite the Club’s influence and it remained on the List (Wotton, David, 25 / 70:72, Stirling, 13 February 2008).

In this Section influences on the heritage of the City have been identified, particularly Bowen’s establishment of LOMHAC. Important aspects of the review of the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 will be examined in the next Section.

3.2.8 REVIEW OF THE CITY OF ADELAIDE PLAN 1976-81

The Council endorsed a six-stage review process of the City Plan to occur during years four and five of the current Plan in keeping with its governance agreement with the State and this will be examined in this Section.

Preliminary work on Stage 1 - an examination and critical appraisal of the existing Plan - began in the City Planner’s Department in early July 1979. This work provided a “position statement” of attainment to date. The Lord Mayor convened an all day seminar of elected members and Heads of Departments of the ACC on Sunday 29 July 1979. Bowen also invited Webb (from Perth) who had contributed to the USC Planning Study to participate. Town Clerk Arland made the point to the Seminar that almost half of the elected members present were not members when the City of Adelaide Plan 1976–81 had been adopted and it was therefore important that new thinking be brought to bear in the review of the City Plan. Arland also presented a paper on governance to the Seminar in which he commented on the unique system of planning operating in the City. He observed:

It is worthwhile saying that the statutory powers given to this Council are unique in both their form and in the fact that they apply to this Council alone. This uniqueness speaks volumes for the level of cooperation and understanding achieved between the State Government and the Council in the preparation and acceptance of the Plan and its philosophies. 136

136 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 4688, Part 2.
Stage 2 was the preparation of Discussion Papers which sought to identify issues that would need to be considered by the ACC, State and the public. Each Discussion Paper related to an Objective in the Plan and they formed the basis for “Search Seminars” to which carefully selected participants from the State and the public who could contribute to the identification of issues were invited. Participants included representatives from key State Departments (such as Housing, Transport, Environment, Arts and Tourism); the North Adelaide Society and the Adelaide Residents’ Association; academics (such as the Professor of Architecture at the University of Adelaide), and some professional organisations (such as the RAIA-SA and BOMA). The Secretary of the CAPC (Faunt) attended each Search Seminar to ensure the CAPC was kept informed of progress (ACC 1981, p.11).

The CAPC at its August meeting considered guidelines for the review of the City Plan. In terms of governance, the CAPC decided that it would comment primarily on matters of policy where the State had a substantial interest; comment on areas where there was a potential statutory responsibility; and would facilitate appropriate expert advice from the State. Faunt confirmed the CAPC would coordinate all the State responses on the review of the City Plan. This would allow the CAPC to provide an overview and resolve any conflicts between different State Departments and agencies and this was seen as an important task for the joint body in terms of the ACC/State governance arrangements.

Stage 3 comprised revision of the existing Plan arising from the various consultations. As part of this stage there was an all day seminar on Sunday 21 September 1980 for ACC elected members and Heads of Department. The State members and the Secretary of the CAPC were also invited. Draft revised Objectives and Policies were agreed as strategic elements and then the ACC adopted them for the purposes of public exhibition in the form of a draft City Plan 1981–86.

An exhibition of the draft City Plan comprised Stage 4 thus formal representations could be received from the public and the State. This exhibition opened in the City Planner’s Department on 7 October 1980 and closed on 9 January 1981. A letter from Bowen was sent to every resident and business in the City inviting their participation and there were advertisements in the local press. Copies of the revised Objectives and Policies were made available free of charge and over 1500 copies were distributed. At the close of the exhibition 94 written representations had been received from most of the major organisations with an interest in the City.

---

137 State Records. See Minutes of the CAPC meeting 6 August 1980. Box GRS 4083/00001/03.
138 Adelaide City Archives. See Minutes of the ACC meeting 29 September 1980, p.193.
The CAPC provided comments to the ACC in December on the draft Objectives and Policies. There was general support for the proposed changes but it was considered there was a need for a commercial development programme to achieve the Economic Base Objective. The proposed Heritage Study to establish a Register of Heritage Items for the City was strongly supported provided there was no conflict with State or Commonwealth heritage agencies. The CAPC noted a new policy had been included to encourage energy efficiency in building design. The most important policy change was proposed for on-site parking in Zone X (Figure 33).

Figure 33 – Zone X, No on-site parking
Source: City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81, p.40

The business community had severely criticised the policy of no on-site parking in Zone X in the existing Plan and the importance of the essential business parker had been recognised in two new policies. Scrafton (Scrafton, Derek, ohi 43 / 76:80, Adelaide, 12 May 2008) recalls Clarke had proposed Zone X in the City of Adelaide Planning Study. No cars would be allowed in new buildings in the City centre. This was an innovative concept far ahead of its time and while Zone X was included in the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81, it was subsequently abandoned in the City of Adelaide

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 235 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

139 The thrust of these two new policies was to ensure that any parking in Zone X demonstrated an economic advantage to the City (CCoA 1981, p.42).
Plan 1981-86 because of pressure on the ACC from the business community and developers. The Planning Commission supported this change on the basis that it would strengthen the Economic Base Objective.

Mant’s Department prepared a Discussion Paper on the need for the Economic Base Objective of the City to be strengthened. The ACC supported the policies in the Discussion Paper and advised the State it would support a Supplementary Development Plan for the rest of the metropolitan area to control retail centres development. It would not apply to the City in terms of the separate legislation. Bowen had been active in local government circles expressing concern at the growth of suburban shopping centres, such as Marion and Noarlunga, at the expense of the City. The Council advised the SPA it would be pleased to contribute professional expertise to the review of the Metropolitan Development Plan, recognising the need to maintain the City as the central place of the State in accordance with the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81.140

Bob Teague recalls he was a member of a State planning team set up to review the Metropolitan Development Plan in which Hart had established a hierarchy of regional centres. The team looked at the importance of the City in terms of the metropolitan area and the ‘centres’ policy and questioned why there was separate legislation as the metropolitan area had to be considered as a whole. The City Planner advised the State team the ongoing political influence of the Council needed to be recognised and, in his view, the City’s own legislation would be retained. Thus a new Section 36c was included in the Planning and Development Act, 1972 to control the extent of retailing outside the City. This was to reinforce the State centres policy in terms of governance and assist the City as there was a concern about the demise of retailing in the City. Teague (Teague, Bob, ohi 37 / 14:27, Adelaide, 24 April 2008) observes some of the decline in retailing was attributed to the ACC’s Zone X policy which prohibited any new parking in the CBD.

Stage 5 was a period of consolidation when comments were prepared on each of the 94 submissions received. Only four had requested to be heard in person and a special meeting of the City Planning Committee of the ACC was held to hear these personal representations. Some minor amendments were made to the draft Objectives and Policies as a result of the public representations. Development in the Frame District had been disappointing and a Commercial Development Programme was introduced to make conditions more attractive in the Frame and Core Districts which would increase

140 Adelaide City Archives. See Minutes of the ACC meeting 29 September 1980, p.631.
the level of employment. The Hindley Street Precinct was consolidated as the main centre of night-life to protect the Residential District from incompatible activities and facilities. A new ‘Cycling Objective’ and Policies were introduced to make cycling safer and easier in the City with the provision of better cycle parking spaces. A major concern was the protection of the City’s heritage and a new Heritage Objective and Policies were introduced which also sought to promote a greater public awareness of heritage.\footnote{Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 6346.}

Stage 6 was the formal adoption of the Objectives and Policies of the \textit{City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86} (the strategic elements) by the ACC in June 1981, exactly five years after the adoption of the first City Plan agreed by the ACC and the State.\footnote{Adelaide City Archives. See Minutes of ACC meeting 29 June 1981, p.91.} The Council was confident it provided a sound basis for the ongoing governance of the City \cite{CCoA 1981, Foreword}.

In Wagner’s view \cite{Wagner, Geoff, ohi 19 / 119:121, Burnside, 7 November 2007} the review of the \textit{City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81} was relatively superficial as all the hard work had been done in the original Plan. One failing of the new City Plan in terms of the heritage of Light’s Plan was that there were still no Desired Future Character Statements for any areas of the Park Lands.

Faunt also considers an enormous amount of effort had gone into the Planning Study and converting this into the first City Plan \cite{Faunt, Alan, ohi 38 / 104:110, Adelaide, 1 May 2008}. Thus the first Plan review was more a fine tuning exercise than a major policy debate. The important aspect of the Planning Study and the first City Plan had been the integration of the statutory development controls within a strategic policy framework, recognizing that each component needs to inform and learn from the other. The value of the Commission was it was a body where ACC/State governance issues could be resolved – not just in terms of planning the City; compromises could be reached outside the Council Chamber and State Parliament and in that sense the CAPC was a rather unholy alliance.

In this Section it has been argued the ACC kept to its commitment and agreement with the Government of five-yearly reviews of the City Plan in order to take into account changing economic and social circumstances as well as changing public opinion. The new Plan was part of the continuous integration of strategic and statutory approaches. The basic aims of the Objectives remained valid and they were retained with minor amendments and two new Objectives, Cycling and Heritage, were added. Amendments were made to the Policies as new needs emerged. Some

\textit{...}
original Policies had been implemented and were deleted; some were no longer valid because of changed circumstances and were deleted. Some were reworded to better express their intentions. In the next Section the consequential statutory amendments for the new City Plan are examined.

3.2.9 CONSEQUENTIAL STATUTORY AMENDMENTS

As the strategic elements of the next City Plan had been adopted, the Council addressed the consequential statutory controls and the actions required to implement the new City Plan and these will be examined in this Section.

Another ACC seminar was held on Sunday 21 June 1981 when Bowen again invited Webb from Perth to attend and provide advice on the statutory elements of the new City Plan. There were sessions to discuss changes to the numbered General Principles; the Desired Future Character Statements (DFCs) of the Core and Frame Districts; the DFCs for the Residential District; and the Regulations. The statutory amendments flowed out of the new Plan so that the integration of strategic and statutory approaches would continue. Some administrative work had been done in the City Planner’s Department on the necessary consequential amendments while the draft Plan 1981-86 was on public exhibition.

The results of Action Planning programme 1976-81 were also considered in detail by the ACC during July 1981. The City Engineer’s Works Programme was added as this was the means of implementing ACC decisions which required civic construction works. Thus physical improvements arising from Action Projects could be funded and the overall programme represented the range of financial and human resources needed to implement the City Plan.

The two month statutory public exhibition of the proposed amendments to the Principles of Development Control and Regulations was in the City Planner’s Department during August and September 1981. Comments on the 62 written submissions received were prepared by the City Planner’s Department for consideration by the City Planning committee in October. Most of the submissions were in relation to the C4 Precinct where it was proposed to reduce the plot ratio. The Committee adopted an amendment so that only the Chesser Street area became lower and plot ratio

143 Adelaide City Archives. Agenda for the Seminar held on 21 June 1981, City Planner’s Department File no. 14/79
144 Adelaide City Archives. City Planning Committee Agenda 27 July 1981, Item 2.3. Town Clerk’s File 1487.
in the rest of the Precinct remained unchanged. The recommendation of the committee was adopted by the Council in November and forwarded to the CAPC (as required by the Act) along with copies of the representations received and the comments made on them.

The CAPC fulfilled its governance role in relation to the amended statutory controls. The Commission recommended to the Minister that they be adopted and the amended Principles were subsequently approved by the Governor. They were published in the Gazette on 6 May 1982 and this completed the first review of the City Plan in terms of the City/State agreement.

The Council published the *City of Adelaide Plan 1981–86* in the same square format and style of the previous Planning Study and City Plan but this time green was chosen for the cover. Green is the colour of hope and growth (Kohl 1998) and was therefore appropriate for the expected prosperity of the 1980s. This Plan became popularly known as “The Green Book”. Again the City Plan consisted of three Books integrated into one document. These were –

- **Book 1:** The strategic plan containing Objectives and Policies and the statutory *Principles of Development Control*.
- **Book 2:** The *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976* and seven Regulations made under the Act.
- **Book 3:** The Action Planning programme containing 12 Action Projects, nine Action programmes, and three Research Studies.

This Section has reviewed the consequential statutory amendments arising from the Council’s adoption of the strategic elements of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1981–86*. In the next Section some further changes in the Council and the influence of key individuals will be analysed.

### 3.2.10 CHANGES WITHIN THE COUNCIL AFTER BOWEN’S INFLUENCE

This Section examines the changes which occurred in the Council after Bowen’s Lord Mayoralty as he did not seek a further term, especially as he had used the informal policy initiated by Hayes to help defeat Joseph when Joseph sought a further term.

---

145 Adelaide City Archives. City Planning Committee Agenda 26 October 1981, Item 2.1. Town Clerk’s File 1487.
146 South Australian Gazette, 6 May 1982, pp.1418-1438.
It is argued Bowen’s two years as Lord Mayor had seen him exercise a considerable amount of individual influence. He had chaired the CAPC and maintained ACC/State relations through his personal contacts with Cabinet Ministers. He had overseen the review of the first City Plan and the adoption of its successor for 1981-86. The Heritage Study had been initiated and Bowen had appointed an Advisory Committee for the Study which he also chaired. Lloyd-Jones, who had been a member of the USC Study Team, followed Faunt as Secretary of the CAPC early in 1981. He recalls an incident where Phipps (the Director of Environment and Planning and a Commissioner) had said to Lloyd-Jones “Look, just give Lord Mayor Bowen what he wants” and that summed up Bowen’s influence at the time (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 62:64, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007).

John Chappel and John Watson were both candidates for the office of Lord Mayor in July 1981 as there was no obvious successor to Bowen. Chappel and Watson had both become Councillors when Hayes was elected as Lord Mayor in 1971. They had both progressed to be Aldermen. Chappel had served as Deputy Lord Mayor and Watson was the current holder of this office; both were members of LOMHAC. Watson, who had argued for a City Plan when he was first elected to the ACC (Linn 2006, p.246), became Lord Mayor with the support of the North Adelaide Society and, as a member of The Adelaide Club, the support of the establishment. He was then appointed as the Chairman of the CAPC and assumed the Chairmanship of LOMHAC. As Chappel had lost the election he was no longer an elected member thus he could not serve on the CAPC, SPA or LOMHAC. Councillor Keith Shaw was appointed to replace Chappel on the SPA; Councillor Bill Manos was appointed as a Commissioner and to LOMHAC.

Manos considers the concept of the CAPC was a good one in terms of governance and it was the influence of the individuals involved who brought about change. The CAPC also bridged the information gap between the State and the ACC. When you had a small group of key individuals coming together for meeting after meeting a certain understanding and consistent view came about. It was important to have Heads of State Departments on the CAPC so that they understood what was going on in the City. They could go back to their offices after a meeting and be informed about what was happening and thus could explain things to their political masters (Manos, Bill, ohi 14 / 58:65, Sydney, 22 October 2007).

Measday did not make a comfortable transition from the private sector to local government and he suffered from ill health. After discussion with Bowen he resigned from the office of Town Clerk for
personal reasons in August 1981. Applications were invited by the ACC and the researcher (then the City Planner) was an applicant. After some months of deliberation by the Council the researcher became the twelfth Town Clerk, since 1840, of the City of Adelaide on 1 January 1982. McPhail (McPhail, Ian, ohi 34 / 75:77, Melbourne, 18 April 2008) who was then Head of the Office of Local Government, observes:

> It was ‘very Adelaide’ that a Cambridge MA with a Boxing Blue was appointed as the Town Clerk by the Council. This seemed to be absolutely appropriate and completely in character at the time.

The Council decided that in future the four appointees to the CAPC would all be elected members. Shaw, the ACC representative on the SPA and an architect, replaced the former City Planner. The four ACC Commissioners were then Watson, Bowen, Manos and Shaw. Currie (Deputy City Planner) was subsequently appointed as the City Planner by the Council.

Watson was a long time friend of Premier Tonkin from their days as medical students at the University of Adelaide and they were both members of The Adelaide Club. Watson considered the ACC/State relationship and the governance of the City could be improved by regular meetings between the Lord Mayor of the day and the Premier of the day in addition to the joint operation of the CAPC. Watson instigated such meetings early in 1982 and they continued on a monthly basis until 1992 as will be discussed in Chapter 3.4.

### 3.2.11 SUMMARY

This Chapter has addressed the particular Research Question:

> What were the important factors in the operation of the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976* from March 1977?

It has been argued the Act provided for an innovative and different system of planning in the City and established a joint ACC/State body, the CAPC, for the governance of the City. The *City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81* proved an effective framework to guide the development of the City. It provided a clear indication of the ACC’s land use policies, enabling efficient decision-making by the ACC and private enterprise.

---

147 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 6346. (Confidential section).
148 Adelaide City Archives. See Minutes of ACC special meeting 7 December 1981, p.151.
149 These meetings alternated between the Lord Mayor’s Room and the Premier’s Office and they were also attended by the Director of the Premier’s Department and the Town Clerk.
Dunstan’s resignation after a decade of influence and the election of a Liberal State government could have had an impact on the separate legislation for the City and its governance, but through the influence of key individuals the Council maintained its independence separate from the new State planning system which was introduced through the Planning Act, 1982.

The review of the City of Adelaide Plan 1976–81 was analysed and new issues were identified. This Plan had provided a basis for a programme of positive actions to improve the City, and promoted residential renewal and growth. The integration of strategic and statutory approaches was continued in the next five-yearly Plan, the City of Adelaide Plan 1981–1986. The politics of heritage was becoming an issue within the Council and the innovative City of Adelaide Heritage Study was commenced with the appointment of consultants and an Advisory Committee.

In November 1982 the Liberal Party lost the State election and John Bannon became the new Labor Premier. Thus began a new era in ACC/State relations with different key individuals exercising influence through their involvement in the governance of the City and this will be examined in the next Chapter.
CHAPTER 3.3

The operation of the City’s planning system from November 1982 until May 1987; governance, influence, heritage and integration

Election of Premier Bannon - Cooperation and controversy between the Council and State over projects in the - City The Heritage Study - Aurora Hotel - Changes within the ACC - Review of the City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86 - Urban Design and the heritage of the City - Ongoing role of the CAPC - Adoption of the City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91

3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter covers the period from November 1982 (with the election of John Bannon as Premier) until May 1987 (when Steve Condous was elected as Lord Mayor) and continues examination of the Research Question:

What were the important factors in the operation of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 from March 1977?

Key individuals who had influence during this period while the Act was in force are shown in Table 5.

I will argue the governance arrangements were tested when there was controversy between the Council and the State over the State’s proposal to redevelop the Adelaide Railway Station and Environs (ASER) as the proposal did not comply with the provisions of the City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86. I will also argue that the heritage of the City, including urban design, emerged as the major issue in the City Plan review. The ongoing role of the Planning Commission is reviewed, particularly in relation to adoption of the City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91. Finally, I will argue that the integration of strategic and statutory approaches continued in this next City Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role and Office Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bannon*</td>
<td>Labor Premier of South Australia from 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Hopgood*</td>
<td>Deputy Premier, Labor Minister for Planning from 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Watson+</td>
<td>Lord Mayor, Chairman CAPC until 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Chapman*</td>
<td>Lord Mayor, Chairman CAPC 1983-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Jarvis+</td>
<td>Lord Mayor, Chairman CAPC 1985-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Manos*</td>
<td>Councillor, Commissioner, Chairman Plan Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Phipps*</td>
<td>Commissioner and Director, Department of Environment &amp; Planning until 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian McPhail*</td>
<td>Commissioner and Director, Department of Environment &amp; Planning from 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Lloyd-Jones*</td>
<td>Secretary, CAPC 1980-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Moulds*</td>
<td>Secretary, CAPC 1983-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Hele*</td>
<td>Secretary, CAPC from September 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Bechervaise*</td>
<td>City Planner, City of Adelaide from 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Llewellyn-Smith</td>
<td>Town Clerk / Chief Executive Officer, City of Adelaide from 1982 (researcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Signifies an interviewee + Signifies deceased
3.3.2 PLANNING THE CITY IN THE EARLY YEARS OF THE BANNON GOVERNMENT

In this Section the early years of the Bannon Labor government are examined in relation to planning the City and its governance. Bannon saw the City of Adelaide Planning Commission as a unique instrument of governance and part of its brief was to view the City in the broader context of the metropolitan area and indeed the State. He was not aware of any similar joint bodies in Australia. From his perspective Adelaide was different and setting the pace in its innovative approach to planning. The City was the front door and show-case of South Australia and if the City was not working, then not much else did. There may have been some flaws in the system but there was a duly constituted ACC and Bannon’s Government had to find ways of working with it and the CAPC provided this opportunity. Elected members could ‘look at the bigger picture’ and not just deal with local and parochial matters. The State ensured the appointment of high level officers as they were in a position to exert influence and make a contribution. This raised the status of the City but at the same time made sure it fitted within the key issues that were important to the State (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 93:104, Adelaide, 5 February 2008).

The governance arrangement of Premier and Lord Mayor monthly meetings were continued by Bannon who considered Watson was “a courteous and proper gentleman in the traditional mould of Lord Mayors who had no axe to grind and no personal agendas to push.” Watson looked after the interests of the City as his first priority (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 42:49, Adelaide, 5 February 2008).

Lloyd-Jones (Secretary of the CAPC) recalls organising a special meeting between Bannon and Watson (in his role of Chairman of the CAPC) to discuss a controversial State proposal for the redevelopment of the Adelaide Railway Station and Environs (ASER) which exceeded the controls in the City Plan (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 57:60, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007). The controversy over ASER will be discussed in the next Section of this Chapter.

Phil Smith (a Director in the then State Planning Office [SPO]) recalls the Planning Act, 1982 was brought into operation on 4 November 1982 by Minister Wotton a few days before Liberal Premier Tonkin lost the State election and Bannon became Labor Premier. Smith (Smith, Phil, ohi 36 / 100:102, Adelaide, 28 April 2008) considers there was an issue about proclaiming a large Act while the Government was in caretaker mode, but Wotton took the view that Parliament had passed the legislation and he was just bringing it into effect. Don Hopgood became the Minister for Environment and Planning and as the Deputy Premier he raised the status of planning within Cabinet. Phipps, who had been appointed by Wotton, remained as the Head of Hopgood’s Department and a
Commissioner. In Phipps’ view the Planning Act, 1982 gave much needed impetus to the reform of planning in metropolitan and regional local government but the pressures to make substantial change to the governance of the City did not exist at the time. Hains (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 91:94, Salisbury, 14 November 2007) also considers there was no good reason for the State to take on the ACC as there was nothing to be gained. While some in the State saw the separate legislation for the City as an aberration, nobody had the energy or driving force to change it and the SPO was without any political influence.

Phipps, given his long experience in Federal and State Governments, finds it interesting that the CAPC continued to exist. Commissions, though they are set up by Government, are viewed with suspicion because of the Westminster system and the accountability of Ministers. It is hard to separate policy development from policy implementation and thus Ministers do not like being administratively responsible for independent bodies which, by their decisions, are actually creating policy de facto outside the directions of the Minister. While Ministers direct their Heads of Department they cannot direct Chairs of Commissions and this is a frustrating aspect of governance (Phipps, Ted, ohi 33 / 38:59, Wattle Park, 7 April, 2008).

The planning instruments of the City were in Phipps’ opinion of a high quality and leading edge in Australia at the time. However, the planning staff in the ACC needed a strong understanding of the nature of the statutory Principles of Development Control and how to interpret them. The State was accountable to the wide electorate of South Australia and responsible for the governance of the whole State but at its very core and focus was the City and the State had to deal with the powerful ACC. Phipps considers the State left the CAPC in place because the State wanted to have good development controls for the City and its acceptance of the innovative planning system was a means of achieving mutual objectives. However, the underlying governance issue was the function of the City. Tension came when the State wanted a development strategy for the State as a whole but it did not trust the ACC to ensure the City fitted into the State’s strategy (Phipps, Ted, ohi 33 / 8:12, Wattle Park, 7 April, 2008).

The State’s administrative view (Department of Environment & Planning 1982, p.9) was that the Planning Act, 1982 consolidated the policies in the Metropolitan Development Plan and the policies in zoning regulations for individual Council areas into one document. This streamlined and simplified the way in which planning and development was controlled in South Australia. The Planning Act, 1982 and the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 together provided the machinery to
guide the development of metropolitan Adelaide through the 1980s but the urban structure was still dominated by the City with a strong CBD. The ACC continued to have its own legislation because it operated successfully.

Hopgood established a Planning Review Committee which was chaired by John Hodgson (later to become ACC City Planner) with Smith as the Executive Officer. The Committee sought submissions and it went through a long process before coming up with a number of practical recommendations to change the Planning Act, 1982. The great majority of these were accepted by the Minister and the Act was amended. Indeed, many aspects of the City’s system were adopted and this brought the two pieces of legislation closer together. An important decision from the review of the Act was to introduce relevant amendments into the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976. Smith was then appointed as Head of the Legislative Unit in the SPO and became responsible for any amendments to State planning legislation including the City’s Act. Smith (Smith, Phil, ohi 36 / 114:116, Adelaide, 28 April 2008) confirms there was no imperative at that time to change the governance of the City and re-integrate it into the State system.

As one of the conservatives in Cabinet Hopgood did not want to see the City absorbed back into the State system as, in his view, the joint governance arrangements were working perfectly well. Thus Hopgood perceived that change was not necessary on the principle of “If it ain’t broke, why fix it?” (Hopgood, Don, ohi 26 / 42:49, Morphett Vale, 18 February, 2008). The other factor was the high level of experience and expertise the City had in planning personnel at the time. The City’s system was not just about land use planning despite many local governments still thinking that way about planning. There was danger that if the ACC was absorbed back into the State system this old virus could infect the City. Hopgood also considers the Commission played a very important role as a joint body between the ACC and State as it had the ability to look at broader issues of governance (Hopgood, Don, ohi 26 / 36:38, Morphett Vale, 18 February, 2008).

In this Section political and administrative perspectives of the City during the early years of the Bannon Government have been examined. It has been argued it was perceived in the State that there was no reason to reintegrate the City into the State system. Thus the existing governance arrangements under the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 continued to operate through the joint Commission during the period covered by this Chapter. In the next Section the controversial ASER development, which tested these governance arrangements, will be examined.
I argue the development of the Adelaide Railway Station and Environs (ASER) tested the relationship between the ACC and the State in terms of the governance of the City and the role of the CAPC as a joint body. I examine the ASER proposal in this Section.

An Action Project for the Railway Station had been proposed in the Planning Study (USC 1974, p.226) and City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 (CCoA 1977, p.101). This envisaged a redevelopment to meet the evolving needs of the metropolitan transport system with the possibility of a convention centre above the tracks. However, Bannon had proposed a major development of the Adelaide Railway Station as part of his 1982 State election campaign. The ASER proposal consisted of a new high rise hotel; an office block, and a casino in the station building. Mosler (2006, p.179) states the ASER Property Trust was a joint partnership of the South Australian Finance Authority and the Japanese company Kumagi Gumi. It was established to implement the ASER development. She asserts there were significant concessions from the State without which the development would not have proceeded.

The ACC argued strongly ASER was completely outside the provisions of the City Plan and particularly that the commercial building should be in the Core District and not in an area which was technically in the Park Lands. When the CAPC reviewed the ASER proposal it had concerns over the height of the proposed hotel and the location of the office building. Bannon conceded the hotel would be well in excess of the statutory controls and there would be an impact on the Park Lands and thus special legislation would probably be needed to implement the scheme (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, oh 18 / 57:60, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007).

Judith Brine was appointed as a Commissioner in November 1983 to replace Hart. For the first time there was an independent Commissioner and someone who was not the Director (or Deputy Director) of a State Department. Brine recalls the application for ASER most clearly from the time she was a Commissioner. She was requested to meet with the Premier and was “heavied” about the way in which she might vote on the proposal. Brine was very uncomfortable being put in this position and although she was appointed by the State, she considered she was an independent member of the CAPC. Clearly the State thought there might be a problem with the way the ACC representatives would vote but in the event of a tie it would go to the Minister to determine and therefore Brine’s vote was important. By this time the State had appointed deputy members thus there would always be
four State votes at Commission meetings. Brine recalls (Brine, Judith, ohi 42 / 8:17, Adelaide, 5 May 2008):

My vote was important but, as an independent Commissioner not a State employee, I did not appreciate being pressured to support a proposal by the State.

Brine (1984, p.8) argues that the ASER development constituted a direct assault on the form of the City, on the integrity of its boundary and on the visual character of the Park lands. She contends the commercial nature of the buildings did not contribute to civic dignity or purpose and they had no cultural value in relation to the Park Lands.

For political reasons the State chose not to submit the ASER proposal to the Commission and instead introduced separate legislation which enabled the State to bypass the CAPC and the provisions of the City Plan. When the ASER Bill was introduced in the House of Assembly Bannon commented on Clause 8 of Bill. He advised that the ASER plan of development would be by means of Regulations and this would allow the House to have full details. Both the CAPC and the ACC would be able to comment but would not be involved in any decisions.¹⁵⁰

As will be discussed later in this Chapter Wendy Chapman followed Watson as Lord Mayor and Chair of the Planning Commission in May 1983. The CAPC had no role once the special legislation was passed but in September 1984 Chapman formally advised Hopgood the Commission did not support the size and bulk of the hotel; the use of part of the site as an office tower; pedestrian access was inadequate, and the public spaces lacked human scale. However, in January 1985 the CAPC did concur with a decision of the ACC for the demolition of the interior of the Railway Station building to create a casino as Hopgood (as Minister responsible for heritage) had provided advice that this part of the proposal was acceptable in terms of the building’s heritage.

Bannon showed little patience with any critics in debates about ASER and in The Advertiser (11 September 1984, p.14) he was quoted as saying:

While the Government welcomed constructive views by the Council on aspects of the project such as parking and street facilities, it was ‘just not on’ to suggest fundamental changes to the project such as the location of the proposed building – the final decision rested with the Government.

The plans of the development were contained in Regulations to the special legislation as Bannon had promised. Substantial submissions were made by the ACC to the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Subordinate Legislation to disallow the Regulations, but no politician on either side of the House took any notice. The Parliament had effectively become the planning authority for ASER, a development far outside the statutory provisions of the City Plan, and the governance of the City had suffered as the joint ACC/State body had been by-passed. An editorial in *The Advertiser* (5 June 1985, p.12) was critical of the ASER development:

> It is a disappointing and curious sort of leadership that is prepared to be guided by developers rather than the City of Adelaide Plan, the Adelaide City Council and the City of Adelaide Planning Commission.

Scrafton (Director of Transport) was appointed to the CAPC to replace Wayte. In Scrafton’s view the CAPC had established an ongoing planning process for the City with its own momentum and stature. The State agencies could judge which way the City was headed. The respective representatives worked well together and kept things moving between the ACC and the State. While there might not have always been a perfect answer, matters considered in the CAPC were resolved to the best of the Commissioners’ ability. But Scrafton (Scrafton, Derek, ohi 43/ 70:76, Adelaide 13 May 2008) observes in relation to ASER:

> Sitting around a table and discussing matters was a much better approach to the governance of the City than open political warfare between the ACC and State as was the case with the ASER development.

Bannon recognises the ASER project was one which caused a lot of angst with the ACC and the CAPC. There were a lot of issues involved in a commercial development crossing to the north of North Terrace over the railway. While the location of the office building and the height of the hotel were problems in terms of the City Plan, all the components were necessary for the scheme to proceed commercially; the State could not sever off the office building from the hotel. Although special legislation had been required, Bannon (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 49:52, Adelaide, 5 February 2008) observes:

> I considered the scheme actually turned out very well and had brought about a radical change to the City.

In this Section it has been argued the controversy between the ACC, the Planning Commission and the State over ASER put at risk the cooperative governance arrangements for the City but the CAPC survived. The heritage of the City was also becoming a political issue for the Council and Bannon in the early 1980s and the City’s Heritage Study will be examined in the next Section.
3.3.4 THE CITY OF ADELAIDE HERITAGE STUDY

As described in the last Chapter a Lord Mayor's Heritage Advisory Committee (LOMHAC) and been appointed and Donovan, Marsden & Stark (DMS) engaged to carry out a heritage study of the City. This Section reviews the study in detail.

Mosler (2006, p.19) argues the Bannon Government was committed to development, especially in the City, but often at the expense of the City's heritage. Bannon tended to focus on the politics of development and he created the South Australian Finance Authority to assist the private sector. There was a reduction in State Heritage Branch staff and thus there were inadequate resources to properly research items and produce reports. Mosler asserts items which may have been of State significance were lost before they were evaluated and this changed the built environment and the heritage of the City.

The City of Adelaide Heritage Study consisted of three stages as follows:

Stage 1 - research, describe and assess the historical influences (social, economic, physical and environmental) which had given Adelaide its character and prepare an inventory of items and areas of heritage, streetscape and landscape significance in the City.

Stage 2 - review economic and legal aspects of heritage conservation in the City.

Stage 3 - develop policy guidelines for inclusion in the City of Adelaide Plan to ensure that future development would be in harmony with the identified character of the City.

The building inventory of the City of approximately 7500 items had identified some 1500 properties as worthy of preliminary assessment. DMS reduced this list to 436 items which they considered should be assessed in detail. An Assessment Summary Sheet (Appendix 23) to evaluate these items was adopted by LOMHAC.

DMS proposed that the City of Adelaide Heritage Register comprise three components – a definitive Register; an Interim List which indicated items which had some significance but remained to be fully assessed and documented, and a ‘Character Schedule’ consisting of groups of buildings and streetscapes and conservation areas which contributed to the City’s distinctive character. Davison (1986, p.5) argues that in a recently-settled country like Australia a sufficient number of buildings and objects need to be kept as reminders of the origins of the country. He further contends (ibid, p.11) that the historic significance of a building is not only its intrinsic qualities but its surroundings.
Any development application for an item being considered for the Register was referred to the Advisory Committee for comment before the application was determined by the ACC. LOMHAC placed the 132 buildings, which were on the non-legally binding National Trust list, on the Register without further assessment. 304 other items were documented and assessed by DMS. Each item was voted on and the majority decision prevailed whether or not to list the item. However, DMS wrote to the ACC expressing concern that in their view LOMHAC was being swayed by development options on particular sites rather than the information about historical significance that was being placed before the committee. About 50 buildings recommended by DMS were not accepted for the draft Register. One of these was the Aurora Hotel in Hindmarsh Square which will be discussed in more detail in the next Section because of its importance to the heritage debate.

Marsden, Stark & Sumerling (1990, p.46) argued Adelaide retained living history on a grand scale. The grain and texture of townscape, the cohesion of urban areas and not just forlorn and isolated gems, were worthy of conservation. Groups of buildings provided three dimensional evidence which photographs and written documentation could not. They suggested that there was general agreement on preserving the heritage of Light’s Park Lands which were the City’s most distinctive asset and made it different from the other Australian capital cities. Jones (2006, p.129) observes a separate report for the ACC on the heritage of the Park Lands was prepared by Johnston & Elphinstone (1983). In the opinion of Marsden, Stark & Sumerling the Council, through its City Plans, needed to balance development with the ‘character of place’ so that the new could coexist with the old as part of the City’s heritage.

Mant was engaged by the ACC for Stage 2 of the Study – the economic and legal aspects of heritage conservation. Mant advised that there could be no guarantee that a building which had not been placed on the official register would not attract the attention of some community group or non-government conservation body if it was threatened. He recommended the system for the City’s heritage be based upon the provision of financial and non-financial incentives to conserve, rather than the awarding of compensation. Mant also recommended that economic factors not be taken into account at the time of listing. This caused concern to some of the elected members of the ACC and on their behalf Bowen wrote to the Lord Mayor about Mant’s recommendation and suggested that the financial implications of listing had to be addressed in much broader terms. Watson responded that

---
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all the items proposed to be listed had been professionally and carefully researched by DMS, and the composition of LOMHAC reflected a high degree of professionalism.\footnote{Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 7601, Part 1.}

After the Mant Report was received Transferable Floor Area (TFA) was at the forefront of discussion about heritage within the Council.\footnote{Adelaide City Archives. City Planner’s Department File 3019.} TFA was a device intended to remove pressure on demolition and redevelopment of heritage-listed buildings by enabling unrealised development potential of heritage items to be sold from donor to recipient sites. Hamnett (1987, p.68) considers the TFA scheme was an important innovation for Adelaide and the protection of its heritage. It was a mechanism to compensate for the loss of development potential on heritage sites and its characteristics were:

- a clear method of calculation of TFA
- the register of available space and transfers kept by the ACC
- a limit on the number of recipient sites from one donor
- transfers limited to the Core and Frame Districts with none in the Residential District
- the total TFA limited by the maximum plot ratio on recipient sites
- the overall bonus plot ratio system to limit the amount of bonus that could be achieved by means other than TFA
- a formal agreement between the ACC and the donor site to be binding, especially on future owners.

DMS recommended a Character Schedule of 715 buildings which they considered contributed to the City’s distinctive townscape but were deemed not to meet the LOMHAC criteria for listing. The Advisory Committee endorsed the importance of the Character Schedule in terms of Principle 25 (Townscape and Amenity) of the City of Adelaide Plan but it was recognised the Schedule did not have any legal status.

Hopgood, mindful of the controversy over ASER, wrote to Watson in March 1983 about the importance of cooperation and coordination in the governance of the City in terms of its heritage. It was agreed that items within the City on the new State Register established under the South Australian Heritage Act, 1978 be added to the draft City Register. This then contained 419 items of which 363 were buildings and the remainder included items such as the Rotunda in Elder Park, the
Albert Bridge and the scoreboard at the Adelaide Oval. Once a building was listed there was good cooperation between the ACC and the State, and they both approached the Commonwealth Government for tax and rate concessions in the form of a specific depreciation allowance or a deduction for expenditure on a restoration project. Taxation relief was considered a major issue for listed properties whose retention contributed to the heritage of the City.

In April 1983 LOMHAC adopted the City Heritage Register as recommended by DMS and forwarded it to the Council. Watson and Hopgood discussed the legal aspects of the proposed Register in terms of the governance of the City’s heritage. It was considered there needed to be changes to the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 with a new General Principle for Heritage as well as changes to the Regulations and the matter was referred to the CAPC. The Commission advised the ACC in September 1983 of its suggestions to give statutory weight to the Register and these were adopted and forwarded to the Minister with a formal request for the statutory changes. Thus there would be integration of strategic and statutory approaches to the heritage of the City within the existing planning system.

Watson continued the tradition of only serving for a limited term as Lord Mayor but returned to a position of Alderman on the Council. In May 1983 Wendy Chapman was a candidate for the Lord Mayoralty. Chappel, who had lost to Watson at the last election, was again a candidate. Chapman had been a Councillor for some years and was a member of the State Heritage Committee. Two historic houses in North Adelaide, ‘Kingsmead’ and ‘Belmont’, were on the interim State Heritage list. In 1982 Chappel was the architect for a proposal to demolish ‘Kingsmead’ and erect a six storey apartment block. The ACC was not supportive of the proposal as it was contrary to the statutory controls, particularly the DFC Statement for this part of North Adelaide. Chappel appealed the decision for refusal to the Appeals Tribunal but Judge Roder, in an important judgement about the City’s statutory controls, considered that there would be a private advantage, but demolition was not in the community’s interest.
Chappel's involvement in the ‘Kingsmead’ development became a factor in the Lord Mayoral election and Chapman won with the support of the residential electors in North Adelaide as the loss of the City’s heritage was becoming an important issue. Adelaide was again different as Chapman was the first female Lord Mayor of an Australian capital city. She became Chair of the CAPC and LOMHAC. The Council members of the Commission were then Chapman, Watson, Manos and Shaw.

Bryan Moulds replaced Lloyd-Jones as Secretary of the CAPC in February 1984. Chapman considers the CAPC was a sound body for handling matters to which the ACC or the State had a claim. She worked closely with Moulds for the governance of the City as she believed the CAPC provided a vehicle for compromises to be reached (Chapman, Wendy, ohi 29 / 93:95, Adelaide 20 March, 2008). Moulds considers the CAPC played an important role in relation to City Plans because, from the first Plan for 1976-81, they were unique in terms of development control processes. The concept of “Desired Future Character Statements” was difficult to comprehend and the Commission provided a forum where clarification and direction could be given to what the word pictures meant. Moulds further considers the planning system in Adelaide could not have operated without a body such as the joint CAPC being part of the development control process (Moulds, Bryan, ohi 39 / 118:124, Adelaide, 3 April, 2008).

Chapman held an informal meeting of elected members in the Lord Mayor’s Room on Sunday 26 June 1983 to discuss the recommended Heritage Register and this was attended by DMS and Mant who explained its implications. Later, in November 1983, the Council authorised the public exhibition of the Register but did not endorse it. Chapman wrote to all the owners of the properties proposed to be listed clearly indicating it was a draft list. Chris Russell wrote a covering story about the Register when it was published in *The Advertiser* (22 November 1983, p.10) which included criticisms from Bowen and Chappel. Bowen said there was no opportunity for de-listing while Chappel objected because the list had been prepared in private (despite the fact that he had been a member of LOMHAC until he lost the election to Watson). Russell wrote a further article in *The Advertiser* the next day (23 November 1983, p.32) and quoted Watson as saying:

> I have been the Chairman of LOMHAC for most of its life. I believe the community wants the City’s heritage to be to be maintained, especially its Victorian character, but balanced with the need for the City to remain the heart of the State.

---
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The public exhibition of the draft City Heritage Register was opened by Chapman on 31 January 1984. It was open during normal office hours (and until 9pm on Friday evenings) thus everyone could have a say about the City’s heritage. The proposed financial and non-financial incentives were also displayed. These were technical and professional advice, Bonus Plot Ratio, flexibility with Planning and Building regulatory standards, waiving Planning and Building fees, the award of a civic plaque and the initiation of a special project where appropriate. The initial public reactions were that the list was conservative. Humble houses and factories were not so well represented, even if they were very old. Hamish Barrett wrote in the News (1 February 1984, p.5) the Adelaide Residents’ Association criticised the list as being completely inadequate to protect the heritage of the City. The Association made a significant submission on the exhibited list and suggested major additions in the form of nine whole Precincts and all the Park Lands. The Aurora Group (which will be discussed later in this Chapter) proposed 531 additional buildings and the whole of North Adelaide. Given the extent of public interest, the ACC extended the exhibition until 27 April with representations closing on 4 May. In an article in The Advertiser (10 May 1984, p.3) Russell wrote that all the 130 submissions received would be referred to LOMHAC together with comments by DMS and the City Planner.

The Building Owners and Managers’ Association (BOMA) raised concerns about the uncertainty created by a building being proposed for the list and the difficulty of providing a valuation on an affected property. In March the Council added two further incentives; the construction of footpaths with suitable materials, and the provision of appropriate plantings adjacent to heritage buildings. Garth Rawlins wrote an article in the Sunday Mail (17 May 1984, p.28) summarising BOMA’s argument that the list was premature as financial incentives had not been finalised. BOMA also sought taxation and rate concessions from the ACC and the State as well as supporting taxation incentives from the Commonwealth.

Chapman invited Bannon to attend the exhibition and advised him she would be meeting with Hopgood to ensure the governance agreement about the City’s heritage continued between the ACC and State. Bannon commented he was supportive of the process and was being kept informed by his Minister on the proposed legislation. Hopgood advised Chapman the Cabinet had agreed to the ACC’s proposed statutory changes and suggested a joint working party to ensure a common position. The working party consisted of representatives from the City Planner’s Department, the Department of Environment & Planning, the SAHC, and the Secretary of the CAPC. Hopgood proposed that the

---
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Register be in the form of a Regulation and that this should be part of the future *City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91* rather than as a change to the existing statutory controls. The initial use of a Regulation to give statutory effect to the Register rather than including the Register in the *Principles* was innovative as it provided a much more flexible planning instrument which could be easily amended when further heritage information came to hand.\(^{163}\)

Garth Rawlins wrote in the *Sunday Mail* (15 April 1984, p.44) that putting the City’s Register into a Regulation, and therefore part of the statutory controls of the City Plan, was an innovation and the most significant event in the City since the Planning Study had been commenced. Ron Boland argued in the *Sunday Mail* (29 April 1984, p.52) that anyone wanting to see modern buildings could go to Sydney or Melbourne – Adelaide could continue to be different and retain its heritage so that the character of the City would be unique in Australia. However, Geoff Harrison, the then President of RAIA (SA) (*Building & Architecture* vol.11, no. 4, May 1984, p.4) argued:

> Few buildings are worth preservation just because of their age, and it must be recognised that unless the City as a whole is to become a museum piece many old buildings will have to be demolished to make way for new ones.

In February 1985 Hopgood requested the SAHC to assess the items on the Register so that the City and State Registers would correspond. The SAHC had an interest in the items that were not justified to go on the State list but were of local significance. It considered groups or buildings or precincts (the Character Schedule) should receive future consideration.\(^{164}\) Mosler (2006, p.55) asserts that the issue of a Character Schedule (which became known as ‘Townscape’) was an important part of the City’s heritage and would be the major political issue within the Council for the next decade.

The old arguments of the establishment and The Adelaide Club (as described in Chapter 2.3) came to the fore and the proposed Register was seen as an abrogation of property rights. Architects were particularly concerned about the proposed controls over new development next to heritage buildings. Tony Kracmera wrote in the *Sunday Mail* (27 November 1983, p.11) that Chapman had defended the size of the draft Register. She had commented that it only represented 5% of the City’s building stock and that many of the buildings proposed to be listed were in ACC or State ownership. Chapman stressed the list was a draft and was for public comment before the ACC made a final decision to adopt the Heritage Register which was intended to preserve the City’s heritage.

---
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The City Planner (Currie) prepared a report on the public submissions for LOMHAC’s consideration. There were three categories – items recommended for which there had been a request for delisting; items rejected for which there was a request for listing; items not previously considered and there was a request for listing. The City Planner argued that it would be impracticable to document and assess over 700 further items and that only about 10% of the requests were worthy of further consideration. In practice, 78 additional items were documented and assessed and LOMHAC, over a series of meetings, worked through all the submissions to decide on additions or deletions to the draft Register.  

Chapman sought support for the ACC’s position on financial incentives and wrote to the Federal Minister for Finance in January 1984 urging the use of taxation incentives for heritage properties. Chapman also raised the matter with Minister Tom Uren at the Australian Local Government Association conference. Uren replied he was supportive of taxation incentives for heritage conservation and had referred the matter to the Federal Treasurer, Paul Keating, so that it could be taken into account in the Commonwealth’s budget priorities. It was reported in The Advertiser (9 July 1984, p.12) that at the Council of Capital City Lord Mayors conference in Perth Chapman had used her influence and persuaded the other Lord Mayors to endorse the ACC’s position on tax incentives for heritage properties. It was further reported in The Advertiser (30 July 1984, p.3) that Roche (former Lord Mayor) and the Local Government Association argued the perceived loss of value on heritage listed buildings had to be addressed by the three levels of Government acting together and therefore supported the ACC’s position. The City Treasurer was requested to report on the costs of ACC rate rebates for listed properties. He advised the Council a 10% rebate would cost $218,000; a 15% rebate $327,000 and a 25% rebate would cost $546,000. In comparison, the residential rate rebate for owner-occupiers in the 1984/85 ACC budget was $409,000.

The ACC also made a submission to the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Fiscal Incentives of Environmental Objectives (which included heritage). It was argued that there should be a range of measures including low interest loans, grants, rate remissions, rate holidays, rate rebates and subsidised mortgages and that the Commonwealth Government had a leading role to play in
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terms of the nation’s heritage.\textsuperscript{168} However, the Commonwealth Parliament was dissolved on 26 October 1984 and thus the Standing Committee automatically ceased without completing its Inquiry.

Keating replied to Chapman in August 1984 advising the Commonwealth would not provide taxation concessions to preserve built heritage. He argued buildings in commercial use could already claim outgoings and he had concerns about criteria for eligibility. Chapman was persistent and requested Keating reconsider his position and she suggested the National Trust of South Australia could act as an independent organisation to receive tax deductible gifts which would assist in preserving the City’s heritage. Chapman also requested the Valuer-General to rate City heritage properties on the basis that they had no development potential and that this would have a significant impact in terms of lower State taxes and rates. In an important decision the Valuer-General agreed to rate heritage listed properties in the City on the basis of their existing use rather than their “highest and best” use under the City Plan.\textsuperscript{169}

Currie decided to retire and an international search was undertaken by the ACC to find a new City Planner. Harry Bechervaise, an architect/planner from Sydney, recalls being interviewed for the position by Chapman and the Chairman’s Committee of the ACC. After he took up the position in November 1984 he immediately became involved in the Council’s heritage debate and the philosophy of concentrating on individual items rather than whole areas. Bechervaise (Bechervaise, Harry, ohi 31 / 40:44, Adelaide, 28 May, 2008) observes:

The issue was certainty for developers in knowing which buildings not to touch.

LOMHAC recommended 35 additional items for listing and a final Register was adopted in November 1984 and referred to the ACC. Because a number of elected members had an interest in some of the properties recommended, legal advice was obtained on their ability to vote on the Register. Individual properties owned by members had to be voted on separately which allowed them to declare an interest and not vote under the provisions of the \textit{Local Government Act, 1934}. The City of Adelaide Heritage Register, as recommended by LOMHAC, was adopted by the Council in February 1985 but the Register then had to be exhibited in terms of the statutory provisions of the \textit{City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976}. As an input into the statutory changes for the \textit{City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91}, discussions were held between the ACC, State, BOMA, and the National Trust of South
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Australia to agree what would be included in a new General Principle and the innovative approach of a Regulation to authorise the Register.

Hopgood wrote to Chapman and congratulated the Council on its innovative approach to the City’s heritage which showed Adelaide had provided leadership for conservation to all Australian Local Government.\textsuperscript{170}

Mant was also engaged at this time to give further advice about the statutory controls for the ‘retention of character’. He concluded the existing DFCs were too vague for this purpose and were open to wide interpretation. Thus the Register should only be for significant individual sites and \textit{not} include ‘Townscape’. Therefore the contribution that groups of buildings and streets made to the heritage of the City needed to be addressed as part of the DFCs. Bechervaise concluded it would not be possible to include this amount of work in the review of the DFCs for the next City Plan and the Council agreed.\textsuperscript{171}

Chapman thinks her regular meetings with Bannon worked well for the governance of the City, especially as the meetings alternated between his office and the Lord Mayor’s Room. She (Chapman, Wendy, \textit{ohi} 29 / 54:83, Adelaide, 20 March 2008) observes:

\begin{quote}
While we did not always agree, there was a fair bit of honesty and I considered that there were occasions when the thinking of the Council changed the Government’s view. This reflected the importance of the personal relationship between the Premier and Lord Mayor and their influence.
\end{quote}

Bannon (Bannon, John, \textit{ohi} 23 / 42:49, Adelaide, 5 February 2008) reflects on his relationship with Chapman:

\begin{quote}
Chapman was keen to get some runs on the board. I had only recently become Premier and the State was just coming out of recession so I was also keen for things to happen. Thus our interests coincided and this helped things to move along in the City.
\end{quote}

Chapman met regularly with the Town Clerk/CEO (the researcher) to discuss all the major issues in the City. Her approach was to be across all issues and talk to everyone who needed to be in the relevant loop. She was interested in consultation and inclusion and did not want things going forward to the Council until she was certain she had majority support. Chapman therefore spent a considerable amount of time meeting with and talking to elected members. She liked to work things
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through and used her influence as Lord Mayor to arrive at something acceptable and she could not remember one controversial issue where the ACC had not been unanimous in its view because all the hard work had been done beforehand (Chapman, Wendy, ohi 29 / 126:137, Adelaide, 20 March 2008).

However, Steve Condous who was later to become Lord Mayor, commented in his interview with Mosler (2006, p.86) that while the researcher was the City Planner bonus plot ratios above the basic plot ratios had to be earned in terms of Principle 13. It was very rare for the recommendations of the City Planner on applications not to be adopted by the Planning Approvals Committee of the ACC. Developers and architects recognised that there was no point in lobbying elected members; they had to deal with the City Planner’s Department. However, this began to change after 1982 when the researcher became the Town Clerk. In Condous’ view while the City Planner’s Department under Currie continued to uphold the requirements of the City Plan, increasingly the ACC under Chapman was more willing to grant bonuses without the bonuses being justified.

Jim Jarvis replaced Chapman as Lord Mayor in May 1985 (as will be discussed later). In August 1985 Jarvis wrote to all owners of properties on the draft Heritage Register advising that it was going to be exhibited from 23 October until 24 December 1985 as part of the statutory provisions of the City Plan review. Thus there would be the opportunity of further comment and the ACC would consider all submissions before forwarding the Register to the Minister for gazettal as a Regulation under the Act. The heritage incentives scheme was produced by a working party comprising representatives of the ACC, the Department of Environment & Planning, BOMA, the National Trust and consultants Edwards, McArdle and Thompson. Llewellyn-Smith (1986) described the Council’s approach to the conservation and development of the City through the use of incentives.

A legal opinion was received from Brian Hayes QC that the General Principle to govern the City’s heritage and the concept of ‘Townscape’ needed to be much more clearly defined. Hayes advised that what was proposed would raise the presumption against demolition and replacement and therefore could be construed as a supplementary heritage list. Bannon advised Jarvis that the

---

172 Bonus plot ratios could be awarded for the conservation and maintenance of places deemed to be of historic, cultural, environmental, architectural, scenic or scientific significance or interest; for residential uses in the appropriate Precincts of the Core and Frame Districts; for entertainment or tourist uses; for required public facilities; and for works of art visible from public spaces.
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State was not prepared to legislate for Townscape controls as the concept was too vague to be acceptable to a Court. The ACC was advised of the political advice from Bannon and the legal advice from Mant and Hayes. It was considered more research and documentation was needed for Townscape to be able to be part of the next review of the City Plan (in 1989-90) for inclusion in the City of Adelaide Plan 1991-96. Thus the ACC’s first attempt at Townscape controls failed, but the public continued to demand more conservation. The concern was about the broader heritage and texture of the City, rather than just the protection of grand buildings as that battle had essentially been won.

The members of Council who were pro-heritage were very concerned about this advice and as a result Councillor Norman Etherington persuaded the ACC to further address the character of the City by adopting the following policy position:

Part of the review of the 1986-91 City Plan (in 1989-90) should be to identify, conserve and promote areas of significant character so that these could be incorporated into the statutory elements of the 1991-96 City Plan.

In March 1987 advice was received from the Australian Council of National Trusts that the ACC had won the Government Category award for ‘The City of Adelaide Heritage Study – Stage 1’ for its outstanding contribution to the conservation and promotion of Australia’s heritage and environment. Jarvis (and the researcher) were invited to the presentation dinner in Sydney to receive the award which was presented by the Governor-General. In April the Council commended all the elected members, staff and consultants who had contributed to the Study to conserve the heritage of the City and the honour that the award had brought to the City. As the Council then had a Register, it committed $200,000 in its next budget to assist owners of listed properties with grants and rate concessions. Jenny Brinkworth wrote in The Advertiser (11 April 1987, p.9) the judges had described the study as the most innovative and comprehensive conducted in Australia. It had provided the ACC with the information necessary for appropriate heritage conservation, including an inventory of buildings and streetscapes after extensive community consultation.

In this Section the City’s innovative Heritage Study has been reviewed. There was a cooperative approach by the City and the State but for political and legal reasons as described it was some years before the Register of City of Adelaide Heritage Items became a statutory part of the City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91 (CCoA 1986, p.273). This was some thirteen years after Clarke had first proposed such
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175 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ACC meeting 9 March 1987, p.2319.
176 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ACC meeting 27 April 1987, pp.2470-71.
177 Ibid.
a register of individual items. Before the Register was adopted the limited nature of heritage development controls under the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 meant the ACC was unable to prevent demolition, especially where the site value exceeded the improved value of the land. The demolition of the Aurora Hotel in Hindmarsh Square (and its replacement with an office building) became an important issue in the City’s heritage during Chapman’s Lord Mayoralty. The story of Aurora and its implications will be examined in the next Section.

3.3.5. THE AURORA HOTEL AND CITICOM DEVELOPMENT

In this Section I will argue the demolition of the Aurora Hotel in Hindmarsh Square was a turning point in the debate about the heritage of the City. Finch, the ACC Commercial Director, recognised the Council’s decision described earlier that any schemes he proposed had to comply with the provisions of the City Plan. Finch arranged with the State the exchange of land the Council owned in Light Square with land owned by the State on the eastern side of Hindmarsh Square which was occupied by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC). Finch had the idea of promoting office development with underground parking in the Frame District as an alternative to the development which was occurring on the other side of the Park Lands outside the City because of the restrictions in Zone X (referred to earlier in Chapter 3.2). Known as ‘Citicom’, the site was bounded by Grenfell Street, Hindmarsh Square and Frome Street. It consisted of seven blocks with individual Torrens Titles and semi-basement parking. The Planning Commission approved the control diagrams for the scheme, which limited the height to three storeys, on the basis that the blocks were sold and developed by the private sector.

The history of the Aurora Hotel was linked to the ABC whose Adelaide offices were in the old Congregational Church buildings to the north of the hotel (Aurora Heritage Action 1984, p.7). In the Action Plan for Hindmarsh Square proposed by USC the hotel’s retention was encouraged as a focal point for outdoor dining (USC 1974, p.215). It was listed as a possible place of Environmental Significance in the Planning Study as Item 208 (USC 1974, p.155). However, the height limit of 15m in the Planning Study for the area was changed to 42m in the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 (CCoA 1977, p.36) and all references to the Aurora in the proposed Action Plan for the Square were deleted by the Council.

178 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ACC meeting 22 December 1980, p.671.
179 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s Department File. 4688, Part 8.
180 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File 3052.
Early in 1982 Ian Quigley & Associates bought the Aurora Hotel. A thirteen storey residential building with 73 units was proposed for the site. In July 1982 the Council's Planning Approvals Committee decided that the demolition of the Aurora Hotel and its replacement with a residential scheme would be favourably considered. The Aurora Hotel before demolition is shown in Figure 34. The City Planner's Department recommended the retention of the hotel in any redevelopment scheme. However, the elected members felt otherwise and were swayed by a residential development in this location provided the design of the building would be architecturally compatible with existing and proposed nearby developments. Quigley subsequently advised the ACC the residential scheme had been abandoned because there was no interest in the sale of units in that location. The land was then sold to Vensa Pty Ltd for $900,000.\textsuperscript{181}

\begin{tcolorbox}
\textbf{NOTE:}
This figure is included on page 263 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.
\end{tcolorbox}

\textbf{Figure 34:} Aurora Hotel, Hindmarsh Square  
\textit{Source – Adelaide City Archives}

In June 1983 the ACC approved plans by Vensa for a six storey office block. A public campaign started against the demolition of the hotel, led by Andrew Cawthorne. He enlisted the help of Norman Etherington who was Chairman of the History Trust of South Australia. At a public meeting in October 1983, Etherington expressed the view that architects took a narrow view of what was worth preserving and stressed the tourism potential of retaining the heritage of cities as had been done in San Francisco, New Orleans and Boston. The Minister of Local Government, Terry Hemmings, criticised

\textsuperscript{181} The major shareholder was former Lord Mayor Roche who had become Chairman of Baulderstone Pty Ltd (builders).
the Council about its decision for the hotel and was thereupon publically reprimanded by Bannon (Aurora Heritage Action 1984, p.26).

A picket line was established and the Baulderstone workers, who were members of the Australian Building and Construction Workers’ Federation, would not cross an official picket line to demolish the hotel. The campaign generated considerable media interest and a petition with several thousand signatures was presented to Chapman. At the ACC meeting in October 1983 the Lord Mayor referred it to a committee, which was the normal procedure for petitions, but this caused considerable concern in the public gallery where the campaigners were expecting the ACC to debate the issue of demolition and the loss of the City’s heritage. The editorial in *The Advertiser* (1 November 1983, p.5) took the position that the campaign to save the hotel was doomed to failure because the building was not on any heritage list. If all City buildings were given some form of preservation listing simply because they were old, the City would stagnate. To be listed, buildings needed sufficient architectural or historic merit but the community had to decide what it was prepared to pay for their retention in fairness to the owner.

Chapman justified the ACC’s position by arguing the application had been approved because it complied with the statutory requirements of the City Plan, and there were no grounds for refusal as the Aurora Hotel was not on any list. The ACC had not wanted the listing of the hotel endangering its plans for the Citicom development and the demolition of Aurora was therefore inevitable. Chapman recalls the controversy in the media over the Council’s action in demolishing the old ABC buildings in the middle of the night to avoid attention and prevent a possible picket line forming (Chapman, Wendy, ohi 29 / 64:73, Adelaide 20 March, 2008).

As a result of continued public unrest, Hopgood, as the Minister responsible for heritage, arranged a meeting between representatives of the Council, the State, the developer and representatives of the hotel supporters. The developer agreed there would be no demolition for 48 hours while options were explored. The hotel supporters suggested that the SAHT could buy the building for low rent accommodation but the SAHT advised the land value for such a development would be considerably less than the $900,000 that had been paid for the site. Consequently, on 14 November 1983 Hopgood and Hemmings issued a joint statement that there was nothing more that the State could do.
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182 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ACC meeting 31 October 1983, p.64.
183 Chapman and the Town Clerk attended this meeting and put the ACC’s position that legitimate decisions had been made and could not be revoked. If the developer decided to implement the approval there was no action the ACC could take.
The developer proceeded to take legal action against five of the prominent hotel supporters to stop the picket and faced with considerable costs the picket line ceased. Etherington (Aurora Heritage Action 1984, p.21) delivered a eulogy on the footpath outside the hotel on 30 November 1983 in which he said:

If what remains to us of Victorian and Edwardian Adelaide lives because Aurora died, that will soften the loss we feel today.

Demolition commenced in the early hours of the next day.

Chris Russell wrote in *The Advertiser* (6 December 1983, p.5) the three independent consultants (Donovan, Marsden & Stark) who had produced the draft Register for consideration by LOMHAC, lamented the loss of the Aurora Hotel as it had been recommended for inclusion in the Register but this had not been agreed. The demolition of the Aurora Hotel and the ACC’s demolition of the ABC buildings for its Citicom development led to the formation of the group ‘Aurora Heritage Action Incorporated’ (Aurora) which then had an influence in debates within the ACC about the heritage of the City, especially as Etherington was elected to the Council in May 1985 when Jarvis became Lord Mayor.

The ACC, recognising there was no third party appeal rights, decided that agendas for future meetings of the Planning Approvals Committee, which were not held in public, would be made available to Aurora and to the Building Owners and Managers’ Association (BOMA). This reflected the emergence of the two factions within the Council; pro-heritage and pro-development. Thus comments on individual applications in the agendas could be made by these bodies and this extended the existing arrangements for the North Adelaide Society and the Adelaide Residents’ Association which, as described earlier, Roche had instigated.

Mosler (2006, p.164) argues the demolition of the Aurora Hotel by the private sector and the demolition of buildings by the Council for its Citicom development raised the public awareness about heritage in Adelaide, and this has been examined in this Section. I will argue in the next Section that the heritage of Light’s plan and the built form of the City became the major issue in the review of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86* and the adoption of the next City Plan.
3.3.6 REVIEW OF THE CITY OF ADELAIDE PLAN 1981-86

The review of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86* is examined in this Section within the context of changes to the *Local Government Act, 1934* which would have an impact on the nature of the Council, and the change of Lord Mayor from Chapman to Jim Jarvis.

When Bannon became Premier he established a new Community Department (which included Local Government). McPhail was appointed head of this new Department and he played a significant role in changes to the *Local Government Act, 1934* in terms of universal adult suffrage and the impact these had on the ACC. The removal of multiple property votes caused considerable criticism in the Legislative Council by people who had such votes, principally in the ACC. But it was Labor Party policy and the legislation got through because the power structures in the Legislative Council had begun to change and there was no longer much sympathy for the ACC. The key individuals with links to the ACC could no longer exert the influence they once had. Amongst the amendments to the Act was a change that *all* the positions on the ACC became two-year terms (McPhail, Ian, *ohi* 34 / 61:71, Melbourne, 18 April, 2008). Chapman sought a further term as Lord Mayor but lost to senior Alderman Jim Jarvis in May 1985, partly because of the convention of limited terms for the Lord Mayor and partly because the new term would now be for two more years, not one.

The nature of the elected members on the ACC started to change at the 1985 election. The existing commercial, pro-development sector was on one side, and the emerging pro-heritage representatives of residential and community groups on the other. The Council nominated the new Lord Mayor, Jarvis, and Councillor Mark Hamilton for the CAPC. However, as the gazetted terms of Chapman and Shaw did not expire until November 1985, the ACC wrote to the Governor in terms of Section 11(5) of the Act to have them removed as Commissioners so that Jarvis and Hamilton could be appointed. The ACC members of CAPC were then Jarvis, Watson, Manos and Hamilton. The State members were Phipps, Scrafton and Brine with Rob Nichols (recently appointed as the Head of the Department of Housing and Construction) appointed as the fourth member. The Commission continued its governance role in the City Plan review process which was about to commence.

At the meeting between the Premier and Lord Mayor in February 1986 Jarvis used his influence to persuade Bannon that the new Head of the Department of Environment & Planning (McPhail) should replace Phipps, who had just retired, on the CAPC. McPhail observes a ‘separate’ City was part of the State’s culture but he foresaw that the nature of the ACC would begin to alter and its influence
would begin to wane because of the electoral changes he had been responsible for introducing (McPhail, Ian, ohi 34 / 72:74, Melbourne, 18 April, 2008).

In July 1985 the ACC adopted a procedure for the review of the City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86 and the adoption of a new City Plan.\(^{184}\) Bechervaise was seconded from his position as City Planner to become the full time Director of the Plan Review. Wagner was appointed as the acting City Planner for the ongoing day-to-day operation of the Department. A separate office for the Plan Review Team was established at 12 Waymouth Street in the City but some distance from the Town Hall. The Team consisted of four full-time and two half-time professional staff seconded from the Department, as well as some support staff. A consultant budget of $152,000 was provided for specialist external advice. A programme was established so that the new Plan could be exhibited at the World Planning and Housing Congress which was to be held in Adelaide from 28 September until 3 October 1986.\(^{185}\) Jarvis wrote to Bannon in August 1985:

> The current plan is in need of a fundamental review to ensure the plan to be adopted in 1986 accurately represents community attitudes for the period 1986-91 and beyond. A very important part of the process will be input by the State Government at all levels. While the City of Adelaide Planning Commission has a role to play in this regard, a political involvement from the State Government is seen as essential for the successful review of the plan.\(^{186}\)

Bannon and Jarvis got on well personally which encouraged the State to make a political commitment to the review of the City Plan over and above the governance arrangements of the CAPC. Jarvis was adroit in persuading the Premier, and three of his Cabinet, to serve on a joint Steering Committee (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 62:69, Adelaide, 5 February 2008). The three Cabinet Ministers were Hopgood; Barbara Weise who had replaced Hemmings as Minister of Local Government; and Gavin Keneally (Minister of Transport) (CCoA 1986, p.283). Hopgood contends this high level involvement by key members of Cabinet was an “audit” of the governance arrangements to ensure the City was moving in a direction compatible with the State (Hopgood, Don, ohi 26 / 41:42, Morphett Vale, 18 February 2008).

The ACC nominated five elected members to the joint Steering Committee. In addition to the four members of the CAPC (Jarvis, Watson, Manos and Hamilton) the fifth was Alderman Michael Harrison (Chairman of the Council’s Finance Committee). Jarvis wrote to all members of the Steering Committee.

\(^{184}\) Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ACC meeting 29 July 1985, p.312.

\(^{185}\) Roche used his influence as the Lord Mayor in 1976 to secure this event when he and the researcher attended the IFHP congress in The Hague and presented a paper. Roche argued on the basis that 1986 was South Australia’s sesquicentenary year and the heritage of Light’s plan would be celebrated.

\(^{186}\) Adelaide City Archives. Department of Administrative Services’ File 1487.
Committee and confirmed that meetings would be held in the Queen Adelaide Room in the Town Hall. In an astute political move the four members of State Cabinet would be guests of the Council on its territory during this period of innovative high level City/State political cooperation about the future governance of the City.

Bechervaise engaged consultants Kinhill Stearns to provide a major input into the review in terms of the Built Form of the City. It was argued that Light’s Plan contained sophisticated aspects of urban design but the potential of its heritage had not been realised. Development controls had been inadequate in this regard and not sufficiently fine-grained. The market place had not produced creative, innovative or sensitively designed buildings and contemporary towers had not enhanced the City’s amenity.\(^{187}\) Hamnett argues the heritage and built form proposals in the draft City Plan were seen as crucial elements in developing an image for the City (Hamnett 1987, p.63).

Strategically the Park Lands were an important part of the heritage of Light’s plan. A specific Objective and supporting Policies were introduced for the Park Lands. The new Park Lands Environment Objective (CCoA 1986, p.47) was:

> To conserve and enhance the Park Lands as a publicly accessible landscaped space with generally open character available for a diversity of leisure and recreation activities to serve the City’s residents, workers and visitors.

The Council also made an innovative decision to have statutory controls applied to the eighteen separate parks in the Park Lands (CCoA 1986, p.243). Gerner Sanderson Faggetter & Cheesman were engaged to prepare Desired Future Character Statements for each park which would become a ‘Precinct’ in the Park Lands.\(^{188}\) For the first time, the ACC and the State, through the governance models of the political Steering Committee and the CAPC, had agreed on a joint approach to the management of the Park Lands as an important element of the heritage of Light’s plan. Mann (1986, p.195) argued statutory controls were needed for the Park Lands to ensure they were conserved to serve the needs of the City and provide an unbroken green belt.

In relation to the Living Objective consultants Wilson Sayer Core concluded that the Council had a relevant, beneficial and positive role to play in the ongoing residential development of the City as a facilitator and partner rather than as a competitor with the private sector. No fundamental changes were proposed, rather fine tuning and a change of emphasis was required and this could be achieved

\(^{187}\) Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File 3395.

\(^{188}\) Adelaide City Archives. Department of Administrative Services’ File 1487, Part 15.
with more Precincts, each with a finer grain approach. Action should be directed away from those parts of the City where increased density and consequent loss of amenity would have an adverse effect on the DFC of the particular area. Wilson Sayer Core were also the consultants for the review of the Economic Base Objective and they considered that the City did not portray a unique or distinctive image of identity despite its well designed and compact nature and comprehensive range of activities.

As part of the City Plan review Weise (who was Minister for Tourism as well as Local Government) was keen to promote State tourism as it was seen as a growth activity and she considered the ACC needed to be active in the assembly and dispersal of information; the coordination and promotion of activities; and the encouragement of development. Jarvis advised Weise he considered Tourism depended on the retention of the City’s unique character and heritage and the City Plan needed to clearly set out urban design principles to guide City development. He then agreed he would use his influence to persuade the Council to promote the City within the Tourism Strategy for the State.

Bechervaise understood the importance of the CAPC in the review process and he established a good working relationship with its secretary (Moulds) and regularly briefed the Commission on progress with the review of the Plan. But Bechervaise never had any discussions with the Department of Environment & Planning (DE&P) about the City Plan as the ACC was separate from the State system (Bechervaise, Harry, ohi 31 / 126:131, Adelaide, 28 May, 2008). On the other hand Manos, as a politician, was concerned that a Director in the DE&P who was responsible for advising the Minister directly on the review of the City Plan, John Hodgson, was suspicious of the Council and its separate legislation. Manos (Manos, Bill, ohi 14 / 73:76, Sydney, 21 October 2007) used his influence to protect the City’s position and observes:

> Over many months I developed a special relationship with John Hodgson and we had a lot of meetings in the Mancorp offices. He came to appreciate the different nature and value of the City’s planning and development control system.

Bechervaise prepared an “Urban Design Manual” for desirable development based on the work of Kinhill Stearns and the argument that the key features inherent in the heritage of Light’s Plan were the Terraces, Squares and Major Axes. He began discussions with the RAIA (SA) about this approach to urban design and proposed the lowering of building heights and the plot ratios in the Core District for economic and aesthetic reasons resulting from the Kinhill Stearns’ report. Shelton (1986) argues this
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189 This was discussed at a meeting between Minister Weise, the Lord Mayor and the researcher on 5 June 1986.
was a move to a traditional view of the City where buildings collectively contribute to the structure of spaces. Moulds recalls Bechervaise’s views about the need to retain open vistas and create ‘walls’ to the street but his articulated views on urban design created tension with architects and developers (Moulds, Bryan, ch 39 / 105:108, Adelaide, 3 April 2008).

As a result architects, after initially discussing proposals with the Department of City Planning, started to lobby elected members when they did not get the advice they wanted to hear. Thus the assessment of development applications in the City became political rather than objective. The pursuit of individualism by a number of architects and developers gave rise to concerns about whether the Built Form Objective in the existing City Plan would be adequate to control new development. This Objective (CCoA 1981, p.16) was stated as:

> Shape the Built Form of the City by concentrating the largest scale developments in the Core District generally reducing in scale to the Park Lands and ensure that new development respects the character and amenity of existing development.

Consequently a considerable amount of time and effort went into revising and expanding this Objective and the new Built Form Objective (CCoA 1986, p.42) was:

> To create a built environment which realises the urban design potential of the Colonel Light Plan for the City of Adelaide while having regard to subsequent development and the need to reinforce exiting areas of character significance.

Bechervaise proposed the area north of North Terrace should be designated as an ‘Institutional’ District which would be a transition between the Core District and the open spaces of the Park Lands and this was endorsed by the CAPC. The Commission also supported the increase in the number of Precincts which allowed for a fine grain approach and for detailed controls to be incorporated into the DFC Statements. It was considered this would provide for a greater diversity of residential use and a wider range of housing choices. Overall, Bechervaise proposed a lowering of the allowable Plot Ratios which would result in a less dense development of the City. 190

Bob Teague (a Director within the then DE&P) recalls that one of the biggest problems of the City’s Act was that there no power of Interim Development Control (IDC). Thus when Bechervaise proposed a ‘down zoning’ in terms of heights and densities the result was numerous planning applications to take advantage of the existing rather than the proposed rules. A huge glut of office space resulted from this and there was discussion within the DE&P as to whether the ACC should be given IDC powers to avoid such problems in the future. This oversupply of office space really stopped
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190 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File 3052, Part 8.
development in the City for a number of years. Teague (Teague, Bob, ohi 37 / 48:50, Adelaide, 24 April 2008) makes the important observation:

This lack of Interim Development Control powers contributed to early discussions that the City’s separate legislation should be repealed and integrated into the State system.

The Commission indicated it was generally supportive of the direction the review was taking under Bechervaise but in December 1985 it requested the Council to review all residential aspects of the draft City Plan so that the City would become a more interesting and attractive place to live. It was suggested incompatible uses in the Residential District should be removed and no new ones allowed. The Council was also encouraged to provide for residential uses in specific parts of the Frame District. However, the number of streets in the Residential District being designated as areas of “Townscape Character” was a concern to the CAPC as it was not clear what statutory controls would be entailed.¹⁹¹

Late in February 1986 the Council endorsed the draft Objectives and Policies for the purpose of public exhibition during March in the Review Team offices. At the opening of the exhibition on 4 March Jarvis stated:

We must ensure development is undertaken within the context of the City’s heritage and its many examples of Colonial architecture.

The RAIA (SA) and BOMA were opposed to the changes Bechervaise was recommending because of fears they had of bureaucratic control over design. Over 40 architects marched on the Town Hall with placards and RAIA (SA) President John Cooper presented a petition to Jarvis opposing any design controls. Steve Hamnett (academic, author, City resident and a member of the State Planning Review) recalls the architects marching on the Town Hall and observes (Hamnett, Steve, ohi 47 / 98:100, Adelaide, 6 May 2008):

This was pretty radical stuff from the Institute and the argument was that the best way forward was to have no controls and leave everything to the architects to sort out!

The RAIA (SA) issued a special edition of its Journal where the views of the Chapter President (Cooper) and Chappel were aired about urban design and the City’s proposals (Cooper, 1986). Bechervaise responded to the architects’ criticisms and mounted a spirited defence. He argued the Council was committed to marketing the City as a historically interesting place to visit, and as a comfortable and very accessible place in which to work, live and do business. There needed to be a

¹⁹¹ Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File 3052, Part 8.
coherent built form with a common design philosophy within which individual designs could be developed. He argued that the fundamental philosophy which had guided the Plan Review was that future development should respect the Light’s heritage and planning of the City. Adelaide should capitalise on its strong images so that the City continued to be a special place. The European-influenced architectural styles had resulted in a building pattern which reinforced the spatial features of the Light’s plan. The streets, squares, landmarks and the City form itself were all important elements. The aim was to promote Adelaide as a City of distinction, style, intimacy and character. The fundamental issue was whether to maintain the tradition and retain, reuse and enhance the existing character, or to invent a new one like Perth and Brisbane. The purpose of the Urban Design Manual was to guide the interpretation of the plan through examples of ‘good manners’ taking into account scale, context and the use of materials. It was not a statutory document but a guide to good design to achieve a special sense of place for Adelaide (Bechervaise 1986, p.13).

Jacquelin Robertson (a Professor of Urban Design from New York) contributed to the debate about the nature of the City when he visited Adelaide and wrote in *The Australian* (4 June 1986, p.11):

> Adelaide is in danger of following the ‘Houston effect’. In the extreme this is a threat to sensible development as every building tries to be different and stand out. This is the wrong way for Adelaide to go. The solution is to limit the height and plot ratio.

The CAPC scheduled meetings from April to September 1986 so that the timetable for its governance role in the review of the Plan could be met. Helen Hele replaced Moulds as the Secretary of the CAPC early in September 1986. The general thrust of the proposed amendments was welcomed by the CAPC during this period but there was still concern about using ‘Townscape Character Areas’ as a means of controlling the heritage and built form of the City. Davis (née Hele) recalls there was a lot of controversy with architects and developers after Bechervaise produced a very design-orientated City Plan (Davis, Helen, ohi 40 / 26:27, North Adelaide, 26 May 2008). The State members of the Commission stressed there would be no support to change any aspects of the CAPC’s governance role in the Plan Review process.192

Bechervaise recalls that every Wednesday evening for several months he met with Manos, Hamilton and Mant and the meetings went late into the night. Manos, as Deputy Lord Mayor, had the political responsibility within the ACC for the production of the new Plan. As well as being a lawyer, Manos was a developer and he had a genuine interest in seeing that the Plan would be acceptable and
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192 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File 3052, Part 10.
workable in the market place. Hamilton was the leader of the Council’s pro-heritage factor and was also a lawyer. Mant had been engaged as a legal consultant for the statutory controls to ensure there was integration with the Council’s strategic approach in the new City Plan. Bechervaise considered architect/planners were important players in his Review Team because they were concerned how a building looked and felt in the public realm. The Review Team spent a great deal of time trying to get the words right for each Precinct of the City in design terms. However, with three lawyers going through every word of the draft DFCs which the Review Team had prepared it was extremely hard work. The issue was what the words actually meant in practice. It became clear that Manos viewed the DFC Statements as providing the guidelines for new buildings which would reinforce the existing character, while Hamilton looked at the same words and saw them as the means to prevent buildings from being demolished and the existing character retained. Mant looked at how they might be used in any appeal situation. This summed up the differences in the Council about the nature of Townscape as part of the City’s heritage and the debate in the ACC was to continue for years (Bechervaise, Harry, ohl 31 / 81:98, Adelaide, 28 May 2008).

When Manos started working on the review of the Plan he realised that the new Plan needed some long term underpinning. The essential ideas had to be disseminated so that they became a “given”. The only way that this could be done was through an educational programme for the public. Manos questioned what was being taught at the schools of architecture and planning in Adelaide at the time. He believed generations of architects trained at the University of Adelaide just did not embrace planning and had a particular attitude about design. They knew (and nobody else did) what good design was, and planning “rules” about the heritage of the City should not get in the way (Manos, Bill, ohl 14 / 18:33, Sydney, 21 October 2007).

Manos (Manos, Bill, ohl 14 / 36:48, Sydney, 21 October, 2007) recalls individual Councillors were put under enormous pressure and “the Council became the last line of defence in design issues relevant to the heritage of the City”. Hamilton recalls the political differences with Manos over what the DFC Statements actually meant. Hamilton supported the integration of strategic and statutory approaches to the review of the City Plan and he contended the statutory Principles of Development Control flowed out of the strategic Objectives and Policies. Thus he argued the Principles should have both qualitative and quantitative requirements in a hierarchy with the qualitative controls providing a framework for quantitative controls. This would result in a degree of certainty and the qualitative measures would not be continually questioned. Hamilton contends that when an application was assessed by the planning department only quantitative controls were applied without enough weight
being given to the qualitative controls. The point of view held by Manos was that the DFCs provided a frame of reference for the character and design of a replacement building; it could not be used as an argument to protect an existing building. But Hamilton had a different position and believed a DFC Statement should be capable of preventing the demolition of a building which contributed to the character and heritage of the City (Hamilton, Mark, ohi 41/ 54:68, Adelaide, 9 May 2008). Thus there were fundamentally different political views within the Council about what preserving the character of the City really meant. But the argument in favour of retention of existing buildings also reflected a concern about Adelaide architects and the design qualities of replacement buildings compared to those proposed to be demolished.

At the meeting of the political Steering Committee in July 1986 Bannon made the important announcement that the State was generally happy with the direction the Plan Review had taken for the future governance of the City.\(^{193}\) Hamnett (1987, p.62) argues the draft Plan attempted to move away from the pragmatism of the previous Plans with a return to a more coherent view of the importance of Adelaide’s heritage of Light’s Plan and the Park Lands. While the proposed Desired Future Character Statements for Precincts in the Park Lands were innovative, Hamnett (1987, p.64) contends statutory controls over the Park Lands were unlikely to deter the State from alienating Park Lands for developments such as ASER.

In this Section the use of a political high-level Steering Committee for the review of the City Plan has been examined. Bechervaise’s influence over the future built form of the City, with the political support of Manos and Jarvis, has been described. The adoption of the City Pan (CCoA 1986) will be reviewed in the next Section.

### 3.3.7 ADOPTION OF THE CITY OF ADELAIDE PLAN 1986–91

In August 1986 the Council adopted the draft *City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91* and this will be reviewed in this Section. Jarvis commented in a special edition of the free *City News* that 1986 was a Jubilee marking 150 years of European settlement in South Australia and the new City Plan was to celebrate the heritage of Light’s Plan. Jarvis emphasised the importance of the image of the City, the Park Lands and the historic built form of the Town Acres. From its very beginning the City had been a

---

\(^{193}\) Adelaide City Archives. Department of Administrative Services File No.1487, Part 18.
deliberately planned enterprise and there had been an interest in both its appearance and economic sufficiency.194

To ensure maximum public participation the strategic draft Objectives and Policies of the City Plan were placed on public display in the Old Methodist Meeting Hall (whose history was referred to in Chapter 3.2) for extended hours from Monday to Saturday. The proposed statutory changes which included the draft Register of 419 individual Heritage Items were similarly on display in the Plan Review office. Thus everyone had an opportunity to make a contribution to the City's future.195

A further free edition of the *City News* was issued in September 1986 in two parts. Part 1 contained the Council’s adopted strategic Objectives and Policies of the new City Plan. Part 2 contained the draft statutory instruments of the General Principles and DFC Statements, including the Precincts in the Park Lands.196

The Council then held public hearings on the consequential statutory proposals arising from the adoption of the Objectives and Policies. One was a combined submission from Hayes, Bowen, Roche and Chappel (the four original ACC members of the CADC) arguing the proposed heritage list had gone too far and they were concerned about the implications for development of the City.197

Manos contends the new Plan had to build on the City’s existing assets by acknowledging and reaffirming Light’s grid layout of the City. It maintained the clear distinction between the built Town Acres and the Park Lands and ensured that new development, whilst contemporary in spirit, acknowledged the context in which it was being built. The built form controls were framed to provide a key emphasis on the quality of urban design (CCoA 1986, p.5).

The integration of strategic and statutory elements through the CAPC continued in the *City of Adelaide Plan 1986–91* (CCoA 1986). The square format of previous City Plans was continued but this time the Council made the interesting choice of grey for the cover. Grey is a neutral colour (Kohl 1998) and it was seen as a balance between an ‘all-black’ view (development would be impeded) or an ‘all-white’ view (the City would be a better place) of what was being proposed for the City for the

---

194 Adelaide City Archives. Acquisition 2915, Item 3.
195 Adelaide City Archives. Acquisition 2915, Item 1, p.2.
196 Adelaide City Archives. Acquisition 2915, Item 3.
197 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Administrative Services’ File 1487, Part 18.
next five years. This Plan soon became popularly known as “The Grey Book”. It was structured on the basis of six parts rather than three books which had been the case with the previous documents and it did not contain any of the Council’s Action Projects. The system of city planning in relation to the Council’s broader corporate strategy for the City is shown in Figure 35.

Hamnett (1987, p.69) considers the document was better organised than previous City Plans and it was more readable to have all the development control information gathered together. He argues (ibid) it was a true City Plan concerned with achieving a particular character for the City. On 28 April 1987 the ACC adopted the amended statutory provisions of the City Plan and referred them to the CAPC under Section 8 of the Act. Jarvis, in a Lord Mayor’s report to that meeting of the Council, said:

> Quite herculean efforts have gone into drafting the *City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91*. This has been a consuming passion of the Council but I think when the results are put into practice the process will have been entirely justified. 198

NOTE: This figure is included on page 276 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

**Figure 35** - The City’s Planning System 1986  
Source: Adelaide City Archives. Acquisition 2915, Item 3, p.5.

The six parts of the new City Plan were as follows:

- Part 1 – Objectives
- Part 2 – Policies
- Part 3 – Principles of Development Control (with a specific section for the Park Lands)
- Part 4 – Statements of Desired Future Character
- Part 5 – Regulations under the Act
- Part 6 – The Register of City of Adelaide Heritage items

198 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ACC meeting 28 April 1987, p.2546.
The statutory provisions were gazetted in December 1987 and this concluded the review of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86* and the adoption of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91*. Manos, with Jarvis' support, had provided the political leadership and influence to have a Plan adopted containing a Register of 419 individual Heritage Items (CCoA 1986, pp.273-281). With the new Plan Bechervaise had set a direction for the built form of the City but the nature of the overall character, rather than just the retention of individual buildings, had not been resolved and would continue as the issue which divided the Council over the next few years.

### 3.3.8 SUMMARY

The period from November 1982 until May 1987 saw important changes in the key individuals in the City and State who influenced the planning of the City. The Council's approach to a detailed and comprehensive study of the heritage of the City was supported by the State and the study also won an award from the Australian Council of National Trusts. One of the outcomes of this innovative study was a list of individual buildings which, after due process, became the Register of City of Adelaide Heritage Items supported by statutory controls and with financial and other incentives provided to owners. The loss of the Aurora Hotel, which was not a listed building, resulted in the formation of the Aurora Heritage Action Group and the election of one of its leaders to the Council. Over the next few years Aurora began to exercise considerable influence over the debate about the character of the City within the Council where two clear factions emerged; pro-development and pro-heritage.

Jarvis, with the support of Bannon, established a high level political Steering Committee to oversee the review of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1981-86* and the adoption of the new Plan. But the State was prepared to go beyond the provisions of the City Plan with the ASER development for which special legislation was passed, rather than the governance arrangements of the CAPC being used.

Manos (Deputy Lord Mayor) had political responsibility for the review process within the Council and he exerted a considerable amount of influence, particularly in the precise wording of the Desired Future Character Statements of Precincts. Bechervaise (City Planner) emphasised the heritage of Light's plan for the City and the importance of character. He developed an urban design framework for new development which became a major issue during the review process.

---

Hamnett (1987, p.70) argues the *City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91* was innovative; it enhanced the reputation of the ACC as being at the forefront of Australian integrated strategic and statutory city planning.

In a further innovation statutory controls over the Park Lands were introduced for the first time. However, protection for the character of the City was deferred on political grounds and legal advice until the next Plan Review in 1990/91. ‘Character’ became a very divisive issue within the community, the ACC and the State as will be examined in the next Chapter.
CHAPTER 3.4

The State Planning Review and the end of the City’s separate system in December 1993; governance, influence, heritage and integration


3.4.1 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter covers the period from May 1987 (when Steve Condous was elected as Lord Mayor) until December 1993 (when with the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 was repealed) and addresses the Research Question:

What were the important factors in the repeal of the Act in 1993 when Adelaide was integrated into a new State system partially based on the City’s approach?

Key individuals who had influence during this period while the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 was still in force are shown in Table 6. I will argue there was a decline in the status of the City of Adelaide Planning Commission but it continued its role in the integration of strategic and statutory approaches to city planning in the adoption of the City of Adelaide Plan 1991-96. I will also argue that Townscape, which was an element of the heritage of the City, caused considerable division within the Council and was an issue of major concern to the State. It is asserted the outcome of the State Planning Review was the Development Act, 1993 which integrated Adelaide into a new State system, partially based on the City’s unique approach to city planning and development control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE 6 – Individuals of influence 1987 - 1993</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bannon*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Premier of South Australia until 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Arnold*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Premier of South Australia from 1992 until 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Lenehan*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Environment and Planning from 1987 until 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Crafter*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Planning and Urban Development from 1992 until 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Condous*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Mayor, Chairman CAPC from 1987 until 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Ninio+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Mayor, Chairman CAPC from May 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hamilton*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Lord Mayor, Commissioner, Chairman Plan Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Jose*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian McPhail*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner and Director, Department of Environment &amp; Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lennon*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director, State Planning Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Hele*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary, CAPC from September 1986 until December 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hodgson*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Planner, City of Adelaide from 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Llewellyn-Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer/City Manager, City of Adelaide until 1994 (researcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Signifies an interviewee  + Signifies unable to be interviewed for medical reasons
This Section examines the initial period of the Lord Mayoralty of Steve Condous. Jarvis maintained the informal Council convention of not seeking a further term as Lord Mayor and Condous, the senior Alderman, was elected unopposed to the office in May 1987. At this election Jarvis, Watson and Manos all retired from the ACC thus there was a considerable loss of knowledge and expertise about planning the City and the ACC’s governance arrangements with the State. Condous was first elected as a Councillor for the south-east of the City in 1968 and had served on various committees of the ACC, but he had not been involved in any of the strategic discussions with the State about the governance of the City. Condous chaired his first meeting of the CAPC in July 1987 when McPhail, Scrafton, Judith Brine and Nichols remained as the Government members.

The Commission was then dealing with the consequential statutory controls for the *City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91* to ensure there was integration with the strategic Objectives and Policies as adopted by the ACC. Two special meetings of the CAPC were held in August and two in September 1987 to consider these statutory provisions. The Desired Future Character Statements (DFCs) for the new Institutional District and Park Lands District were innovative statutory controls and the Commission worked through the wording for them in detail. The CAPC endorsed the City Plan and adopted its statutory components at the end of September and referred them to the Minister under the provisions of the Act. These included Regulations to authorise the *City of Adelaide Heritage Register* and the innovative Transferable Floor Area (TFA) scheme which required the Council to maintain a record of any transfers. The CAPC suggested a consecutive numbering system for all the Listed Buildings which would be included in the DFCs within all the Precincts of the five Districts. This clarified the nature of the Regulation and ensured the heritage of the City was recognised in the statutory controls for the first time. After consideration by the Minister and then Cabinet the revised *Principles of Development Control* were approved by the Governor and gazetted.

Thus the *City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91* came into operation as a result of extensive review, major public exhibitions and wide community consultation. It was stated in the Commission’s annual report

---

200 For example, the TFA on ‘Observatory House’ in Flinders Street was sold for $166,200 which enabled restoration and maintenance work to be carried out.

201 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File D3052, part 14.

for 1986/87 Adelaide is unique in the way it plans and controls development in the City with the City Council, the State Government and the CAPC all extensively involved in the preparation of the Plan.\textsuperscript{203}

The administration of the ACC was being restructured in the middle of 1987. At that time Bechervaise was due to return to his substantive position of City Planner. He was requested to take on additional responsibilities for Community Services by the City Manager.\textsuperscript{204} Bechervaise had been influential in producing the \textit{City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91} but he felt exhausted after two years of hard work and long hours and he did not want to have a large administrative responsibility. Consequently Bechervaise resigned from the Council in August 1987 and decided to use his expertise in Urban Design by setting up a private practice to assist architects and developers in their dealings with the ACC (Bechervaise, Harry, ohi 31 / 134:139, Adelaide, 28 May 2008). He was quoted in \textit{The Advertiser} (11 August 1987, p.5) as saying that after being the Director of the Plan Review he did not want to return to the administrative duties of a Head of Department, especially as he was expected to take on additional responsibilities for Community Services.

After an extensive selection process John Hodgson from the State Public Service was appointed as the new City Planner in November 1987. As indicated in the last Chapter, Manos had used his influence to persuade Hodgson of the merits of the City’s separate system during the Plan review and Hodgson became a supporter of the independence of the City from the rest of the State. He was influential in the Townscape debate as will be examined in Section 3.4.5 of this Chapter.

As a result of the changes to the \textit{City Plan 1986-91} made by the CAPC in December 1987, the City Planner reported to Council in March 1988 and recommended that its strategic Objectives and Policies be amended to conform to the statutory changes to the \textit{Principles} and the Regulations. While the City’s planning system had always involved the integration of strategic and statutory processes, the statutory changes had evolved from the strategic Objectives and Policies. Thus it was unusual for the Council to amend its policy document \textit{after} statutory changes by the CAPC, but Hodgson gave a briefing to the elected members about the changes and through his influence the Council adopted them in April 1988. The elected members were also requested to advise the City Planner by the end of August 1988 of any matters which they wanted to have addressed in the next

\textsuperscript{203} State Records, City of Adelaide Planning Commission, File 17/86.
\textsuperscript{204} The ACC had decided that the term Town Clerk/Chief Executive Officer was too cumbersome and the researcher became known as the City Manager in 1987.
Plan Review. Work in the City Planning Department under Hodgson had continued on the preparation of the Urban Design Guidelines initiated by Bechervaise. These were to illustrate the fundamental urban design principles included in the General Principles and Desired Future Character Statements in the City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91 and they were launched by the Lord Mayor in July 1988 (Figure 36).

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 282 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 36 – Urban Design Guidelines
Source: Adelaide City Archives, ACC 1988

It has been argued in this Section that with the retirement from the Council of Jarvis, Manos and Watson in May 1987 there was a loss of political expertise and experience in the governance arrangements of the City. Condous became Lord Mayor and he was appointed Chairman of the CAPC. The Commission continued its statutory role in considering the consequential statutory components of the City Plan 1986-91 but its decline in status, importance and relevance is examined in the next Section.

3.4.3 DECLINE IN THE GOVERNANCE ROLE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

I will argue the decline in the status, importance and relevance of the joint City/State body commenced when Condous became Chairman of the CAPC in July 1987.

205 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Corporate Services File 1487, part 21.
Davis (née Hele), who was secretary of the Commission at the time, observes that Condous did not have the breadth of planning experience needed for the position and he had said to her when he became Chairman (Davis, Helen, ohi 40 / 19:20, North Adelaide, 26 May 2008):

You are really running the meeting – I am only here because I have to be.

Davis further expresses the view that under Condous the CAPC gradually became a body that was essentially run by the State and was no longer an effective joint body for the governance of the City (Davis, Helen, ohi 40 / 17:18, North Adelaide, 26 May 2008). Condous admits he found it difficult dealing with Commissioner McPhail who was the Director of Environment and Planning. McPhail gave the impression that the Council was becoming irrelevant and it was the State that was going to make all the important decisions affecting the development of the City (Condous, Steve, ohi 30 / 95:97, Norwood, 1 March 2008). Indeed, Davis advises that McPhail had pre-agenda meetings to determine how everything on the agenda would be dealt with and he had the State votes arranged. He could usually rely on at least one Council member to support the State’s position on an important issue and there was never a tied vote (Davis, Helen, ohi, 40 / 21:23, North Adelaide, 26 May 2008). Thus the influence of McPhail on the governance of the City was substantial. McPhail makes the observation (McPhail, Ian, ohi 34 / 80:82, Melbourne, 18 April 2008):

I took my role as a Commissioner very seriously but, as in most good committees, the deals had been done before the Commission met.

Susan Lenehan replaced Hopgood as the Minister of Environment and Planning in 1987 and she observes that she found the Commission a valuable joint body for the governance of the City because it was a vehicle for dialogue between the two levels of government; it was the means of knowing what was happening in the City and what was coming up. In this context she found it very useful that her influential Head of Department (McPhail) was a Commissioner (Lenehan, Susan, ohi 27 / 55:60, Adelaide, 7 March 2008).

McPhail also had a view about the governance aspects of the CAPC at the administrative level. He appointed Phil Smith as the Executive Officer to the Commission when Helen Hele was the Secretary. As described in Chapter 3.2, Mant had organised for the Secretary to be based in the Town Hall. McPhail and Smith had two concerns with this arrangement. Firstly, there was the lack of back-up as only one person had the specialist knowledge and background to do the job and secondly they were physically on their own. If the Secretary was sick or resigned and when there were peaks in workload the State had to provide the resources with someone going cold into the position at the Town Hall with little or no notice. Thus the issues were the lack of continuity and back-up, a lack of succession...
planning for a unique job, and the fact that the Secretary was the only person in the planning agency who was writing assessment reports for the Commission without someone else vetting and checking them. It was a policy in the State agency to always have two people involved in development assessments. One person may miss something and ‘not see the wood for the trees’. In the Secretary’s case it was a position intimately involved with the Commission; the City in the wider metropolitan and State perspective might be missed. Smith started attending all the meetings of the CAPC and he was able to bring some influence to bear on alternative or different perspectives on issues before the Commission. He (Smith, Phil, ohi 36 / 38:40, Adelaide, 8 April 2008) thinks the combination of an Executive Officer and a Secretary worked well because there was always a back-up and this gave more security for the State’s agency to responsibly service the CAPC.

Smith also observes (Smith, Phil, ohi 36 / 41:44, Adelaide, 8 April, 2008) there was a perception the Secretary actually worked for the Council. As an individual based in the Town Hall and working closely with the Lord Mayor (as Chairman of the CAPC) and the City administration, it was easy to assume the Secretary had been ‘captured’ by the Council and was not really an independent officer of the State agency. The ACC was advised in September 1989 by McPhail that the Secretary was to be relocated out of the Town Hall and physically based in the Metropolitan Branch of his Department in Grenfell Street. While the arguments about the location of the Secretary were recognised, it was seen by Condous and the City Manager that this move was part of the State’s view that the Commission was losing its importance. However, Condous used his influence as Chairman to ensure the CAPC itself continued to meet in the Colonel Light Room of the Town Hall.

Condous stood again for Lord Mayor in May 1989 and was successful, winning the election against the then senior Alderman (Ross Davis) who did not enjoy the support of most of the other members of the Council. Thus for the first time the tradition of a limited term of office for the Lord Mayor was broken but Condous could no longer rely on the support the other elected members usually gave the Lord Mayor. Also at this time the ACC became quite divided on pro-development and pro-heritage lines with only a few non-committed members. While the protocol of nominating the Lord Mayor as Chairman of the Commission continued, the Council nominated Alderman Brian Anders and the relatively junior Councillors Mary-Lou Jarvis and Sam Christodolou as the other Commissioners. The State retained McPhail and Scrafton as Commissioners but replaced Nichols with Mary Marsland and Brine with Sandra Eccles. Marsland and Eccles were middle managers in State bureaucracies.

---

206 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File D3052, part 19.
(Housing and Technology respectively) and not Heads of Departments. Thus there was a perceived loss of status in Government appointments. From the appointment of this Commission there were no Policy or Project reports on CAPC agendas for the remainder of 1989 and it only carried out its statutory functions.\textsuperscript{207} Davis observes the Council representatives did not have the interest or expertise they once had; they were parochial and they failed to think of the broader picture. It became obvious to Davis the elected members lost direction over the years and no longer supported the planning function; development of the City at all costs was the agenda until the pro-heritage faction took control of the Council in 1991 (Davis, Helen, ohi 40 / 67:69, North Adelaide, 26 May 2008). I therefore argue that from both the City and State perspectives at that time the role of the joint Commission in the governance of the City was beginning to lose its relevance and importance.

At the elections in May 1991 Condous was again a candidate for Lord Mayor. While he was successful, for the first time the pro-heritage faction, with substantial campaigning by Aurora, took control of the Council with a majority of ten votes to six. Alderman Mark Hamilton became the Deputy Lord Mayor with responsibility for the review of the City Plan 1986-91 and the adoption of the City Plan 1991-96. While the Council nominated Condous as Chairman the other three Commissioners from 1 July 1991 were Councillors Jane Rann, Chris Douglas and Alan Rye, all of the pro-heritage faction.\textsuperscript{208} The State Government replaced McPhail with David Ellis (from the Department of Environment and Planning), Scrafton with Rod Payze (the new Director of the Department of Transport) and Eccles with Mary Beasley (from the Health Industry). Thus only Condous and Marsland provided any continuity and knowledge of the governance arrangements of the City and there were six new Commissioners.\textsuperscript{209} Davis recalls that of the new Commissioners who made a contribution to CAPC debates Rann had been passionate about heritage on the Council side and Payze stood out on the Government side as he thought broadly about the planning issues affecting the City (Davis, Helen, ohi 40 / 58:62, North Adelaide, 26 May 2008).

Jane Jose (Jane Rann as a Councillor) considers there was a deliberate downgrading of the CAPC by the State by the time she was appointed to the Commission (Jose, Jane, ohi 45 / 79:80, Adelaide, 2 May 2008). Payze considers the Council members on the Commission had a strong view to protect the City’s existing position rather than let it grow. The State believed the pro-heritage Council was anti-development and it was therefore good to have a broader perspective in the CAPC from the State.

\textsuperscript{207} Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File D3144, part 4.
\textsuperscript{208} Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File D3052, part 21
\textsuperscript{209} SA Government Gazette 20 August 1991, p.885.
members. They were able to look at the wider economic and social implications of development rather than the ACC members who were conscious of the voting consequences of the City electorate resulting from the CAPC decision-making. There were views within Government that from the early days the City had been the catalyst for the growth, development and prosperity of the State. But by the early 1990s there were other centres within the metropolitan area besides the CBD. There was a growing feeling in the State that the Council had become introspective and thought too much of its own importance and thus it was not taking into account the broader planning issues. Payze (Payze, Rod, ohi 44 / 59:62, Hyde Park, 19 May 2008) reflects on the changes:

The Commission had become orientated to its statutory role of assessment and its importance was declining as the State was pursuing a multi-centered metropolitan area. The influence of the ACC had changed since the 1970s and the State no longer needed a separate system for the City.

As will be reviewed in Section 3.4.7 of this Chapter, Henry Ninio was elected unopposed as Lord Mayor in May 1993 and the pro-development faction gained control of the Council (nine votes to seven). The Lord Mayor (who became Chairman) and Christodoulou were nominated as Commissioners but it was surprising Rann and Douglas (pro-heritage) were also nominated. The Government members Payze, Ellis, Marsland and Beasley remained unchanged. However, by this time the Commission had a limited life as the political decision had been made by the State to repeal the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 and integrate the City into the State system as will be examined later in this Chapter.

It was symptomatic of the situation that after Ninio became the Chairman there were no policy items on any of the agendas for the CAPC monthly meetings from July through to December 1993. By the time the Commission ceased to exist it was really only acting as a development assessment authority and did not have any broader governance or strategic role in the City (Smith, Phil, ohi 36 / 127:128, Adelaide, 8 April, 2008).

The role of the CAPC in the adoption of the City of Adelaide Plan 1991-96 will be examined in Section 3.4.8 of this Chapter. The last meeting of the joint City/State body for the governance of the City - the innovative and different City of Adelaide Planning Commission - was held on 15 December 1993. In its early days the Commission had consisted of key individuals from the ACC and the State who had exerted considerable influence on the development of the City. But, as I have argued in this Section, its status, importance and relevance started to decline when Condous became Chairman in 1987.

---

In the next Section the proposed and eventual demolition of the House of Chow Restaurant is analysed from the point of view that it was central to the debate about the issue of Townscape as an element of the heritage of the City. This divided the Council during Condous’ Lord Mayoralty and became a matter of major concern to the State.

3.4.4 HOUSE OF CHOW RESTAURANT

It was argued in Chapter 3.3 that the demolition of the Aurora Hotel was a pivotal point in the debate about the heritage of the City in terms of individual buildings. I will argue in this Section that the demolition of the House of Chow Restaurant in Hutt Street in the south-east of the City was a turning point in the divisive debate about the retention of the character of the built form of the City (Townscape). An application to demolish the House of Chow (Figure 37) and replace it with a three-storey office building was approved by the ACC late in 1987 as it was considered it met the statutory controls, subject to the concurrence of the Commission. Hodgson, who was then the City Planner, observes (Hodgson, John, ohi 32 / 105:108, Adelaide, 11 March 2008):

The building had no heritage protection. There were better buildings of its type elsewhere in the City and it had been extensively modified internally and externally. But it was seen by the community as a landmark building and it became symptomatic of the Townscape debate.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 287 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 37 – House of Chow Restaurant, Hutt Street
Source: Adelaide City Archives

The House of Chow was on the City’s Character Schedule and in an interesting decision the CAPC refused to concur with the Council decision and thus the application was refused. The developer
went to the Appeals Tribunal where the appeal was upheld in December 1989. The developer did not exercise his approval for a long time and in the Sunday Mail (14 April 1991, p.5) a spokesman for Aurora argued the building was an important part of the character of Adelaide. In the City Messenger (17 April 1991, p.8) the State Member of Parliament for Adelaide, Michael Armitage, the two Ward Councillors for the area, and the State Director of the National Trust all expressed their concerns at the proposed demolition.

The developer had not previously been involved in the development field and started demolition without the necessary separate approval under the Building Act. Being aware of the issues over the Aurora Hotel the developer used non-union labour to start demolition. The City Building Surveyor issued an order to stop the demolition and a community picket line soon formed. This included Councillors Rann, Rye and Gibbs who were members of the pro-heritage faction which had taken control of the ACC in the May 1991 elections. However, by July 1991 the House of Chow was damaged beyond repair and a union ban was placed on the site because non-union labour had been used for the demolition. Thus the site could not be cleared and was to remain undeveloped for years. The demolition had an immediate impact on the Townscape debate and in September 1991 the pro-heritage Council decided to proceed with statutory controls to protect Townscape. It was considered protection for important groups of buildings was urgently needed to maintain the character of the City.

Lynn Arnold, who was to become Premier after Bannon, (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 26:29, Adelaide, 11 February 2008) reflects on the view in Cabinet:

The phrase ‘to bathe Adelaide in aspic’ was used in Cabinet quite often at this time and there was an irritation about those in the community who seemed to want no changes to the City. There was something of a ‘crane fetish’ and Cabinet considered the number of cranes on the skyline was a good sign and the extent of development was a measure of success for the State.

Cabinet considered what was happening in Adelaide very much reflected the position in the State and the House of Chow was an important issue about development in the City. The State did not want to see the planning system abused by an unnecessary thwarting of a legitimate planning approval. The division in the Council between the pro-heritage and pro-development factions was a point of tension and began to influence the State’s view of the governance arrangements between the ACC and the

---

211 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Corporate Services File 1487, part 21.
State. It was perceived it was hard to obtain a planning approval in Adelaide compared to the other capital cities (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 30:35, Adelaide, 11 February 2008).

It has been argued in this Section that the proposed and eventual demolition of the House of Chow Restaurant and the value of its retention, compared with a new development on the site, became central to the debate about Townscape as an element of the heritage of the City which is examined in detail in the next Section.

3.4.5 REVIEW OF THE CITY OF ADELAIDE PLAN 1986-91 AND TOWNSCAPE

In this Section I will argue that the divisive issue of Townscape (as a part of the heritage of the City) within the Council, and in the community, was an important element in the State’s decision to repeal the City’s separate Act in 1993. Townscape evolved from the Character Schedule which was an unresolved issue arising from the adoption of the City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91 as examined in the last Chapter, and became the major issue in the review of this City Plan.

The Planning Commission established a Plan Review Sub-Committee to have an ongoing role in the review of the City Plan. It consisted of McPhail and Brine (Government), and Anders and Hamilton (Council) with Hamilton as the Chair. Concern was expressed that the CAPC only became involved at the end of the Council’s process of the five-yearly Plan Reviews and it sought to have draft proposals for statutory changes referred to it on a more regular and early basis. Thus suggestions from Commissioners could be an influence in the formulation of new policies and assist the CAPC in its role of integrating the strategic and statutory approaches to planning the City.213 However, it was clear McPhail was going to exert considerable influence when he advised the Council the Strategy Branch of his Department would take a close interest in the review of the City Plan and how the City related to the wider State strategy for the metropolitan area.214

John Hodgson was still in the Department of Environment and Planning in August 1987 when he was asked by Bannon to undertake a brief review of the planning systems then operating in the City and the rest of the State. This was in response to a number of difficulties which had been reported to the Government by both developers and State agencies. The major issue that emerged from his review
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was how the Council was dealing with heritage in the City. A Joint Industry Committee on Planning represented a group of various building interests. They were particularly concerned with the dampening effect on development as a consequence of heritage listings of buildings and argued that a number of buildings had been listed that were of dubious heritage value. It appeared the listing had more to do with architectural character and contribution to the streetscape rather than any intrinsic heritage quality. In their view the objective should be to retain the particular character given by the existing building in a new development, rather than retaining the building itself. They were concerned the ACC’s Townscape proposal would be interpreted to retain the existing buildings rather than with the form and character required of the replacement building (Hodgson, John, oh 32 / 15:33, Adelaide, 11 March 2008).

In April 1988 the Council initiated a study to identify ‘Significant Character Areas’ and the means to achieve them. In a report on this matter City Planner advised that as well as a strategic approach to Streetscape there would need to be integration with statutory controls. Some form of listing and an appropriate covering Principle and/or a detailed specification of appropriate infill development within the DFC Statements would be required.215

Almost a year later a “Character of the City of Adelaide” exhibition was mounted in the foyer of the recently completed State Bank Centre. The purpose of the one month public display was to indicate streetscapes which had survived in the City and were considered to be meritorious. They were marked on Precinct maps and supported by a brief statement of their importance.216 There were 87 responses. Eight were from development or conservation bodies and 79 from individuals. The majority acknowledged the heritage of the City arising from Light’s Plan and that Adelaide still had a character worthy of protection. The City Planner was therefore authorised to further investigate areas in the Frame and Residential Districts as the heritage in the City’s Core District had essentially already been lost.217 The four criteria to evaluate appropriate areas were aesthetic, cultural, historical and architectural which included commonality in terms of age, style, scale, setback and siting, subdivision pattern, detailing, materials, colour and finishes.218
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As a result of the City Planner’s investigation the Council decided the term ‘Townscape’ would be used and an exhibition of Townscape proposals was opened in November 1989 in three locations around the City; the CBD, North Adelaide and south-east Adelaide to encourage wide community involvement. Nigel Hopkins wrote in *The Advertiser* (23 May 1990, p.17) that the Building Owners and Managers’ Association (BOMA) was concerned at the extent of State and Council heritage lists and was therefore completely opposed to the Townscape proposals. The City Planner considered there should be a clear distinction between *individual* buildings and those buildings which *contributed* to the physical and aesthetic quality of the City’s heritage in terms of Townscape. However, in July 1990 the Council decided the relevant statutory procedures would commence for *all* buildings in the Townscape proposals to be included on the City of Adelaide Heritage Register.

I argue this put the cooperative ACC/State approach to the governance of the City at risk as the State was very concerned at this course of action by the Council. Minister Lenehan wrote to the Lord Mayor in August and requested that the ACC consider the establishment of a review committee comprised of Council representatives, State representatives, historians, architects, property owners and residents. The committee would recommend to Council any additions to the City’s Heritage List. The evaluation of any additional items should proceed on the basis of retaining a defensible list meeting publicly available criteria for heritage assessment. The Minister further advised the Townscape proposals should be deferred and become a matter for policy development as part of the review of the *City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91.*

The Council recognised the influence the Minister could bring to bear and in late August 1990 decided to establish a City of Adelaide Heritage Advisory Committee (COAHAC) to determine whether further individual buildings should be added to the Register, noting no additional items had been gazetted since 1987. The City Manager and City Planner jointly recommended appropriate members of the Advisory Committee broadly along the lines suggested by the Minister. There was some concern in the community about the process that would be followed for any additional listing and this caused delay and debate within the ACC. Thus it was not until February 1991 that the Council appointed COAHAC with membership as shown in Table 7. The Council also directed the City Planner to examine the Character Schedule on the basis it was the stock of buildings to be considered for listing.
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in the City of Adelaide Register of Heritage Items, or for Townscape. There was an increase in the staff resources in the Planning Department to provide appropriate advice to COAHAC.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7 – Members of the City of Adelaide Heritage Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Taueber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Cawthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Harry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Lindner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Marsden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate McDougall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Pember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Perse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamish Ramsay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Rowney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Stephens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Wallace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Advisory Committee met on six occasions and worked through all individual buildings recommended by the City Planner after assessment by his Department. An additional 104 items were exhibited and then COAHAC heard objections to listing from 40 owners. COAHAC recommended 117 items be added to the City’s Register. These were the 104 individual buildings and 13 which were statues, memorials, public gardens and the West Terrace Cemetery. They would all eventually become part of the City of Adelaide Plan 1991-96 (CCoA 1992, Schedule 1, pp. 321-332).

Lenehan (Lenehan, Susan, ohi 27 / 14:55, Adelaide, 7 March 2008) reflects on why her idea of a broadly-based review committee was so important and the influence she had on the heritage of the City. If, as a result of comprehensive dialogue and research, the committee came up with a recommendation to list a particular building, then this would be a real defence against a developer wanting to demolish it. As Minister she could argue that the listing of an individual building had not resulted from the influence of the Lord Mayor or an individual member of Council, but from a broadly-based committee after extensive and thorough consultation. This provided a way forward in conserving the heritage of the City through the listing of individual buildings and items, but not groups of buildings without individual merit.
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After the election of the pro-heritage Council in May 1991 the State became more concerned about the Townscape proposals and the implications for the development of the City. Lenehan wrote a further letter to Condous in September 1991 and advised she had set up an informal working party (which included the City Planner) to advise her about Townscape. The working party was chaired by David Ellis of her Department. The City Planner put forward an Issues Paper to the working party which covered:

- Retention of the traditional character of the City
- Equity for building owners (especially in the Core and Frame given the City Plan provisions)
- Defensible selection criteria
- Legislative mechanism for dealing with items identified.

Ellis used his influence as chairman to steer the working party away from the Townscape concept and to give consideration to the use of historic (conservation) zones which were available under an amendment introduced by Bannon in 1987 to the Planning Act, 1982. But there was no such provision under the City’s Act and thus this approach would involve a legislative change if it was to be pursued.

Lenehan recalls (Lenehan, Susan, oh 27 / 14:55, Adelaide, 7 March 2008) there were all sorts of arguments at the time suggesting the Townscape proposals would hold Adelaide back; it was a backwater and the Council was anti-development. It was therefore important for the State to understand what the ACC was trying to achieve and Lenehan considers this involved the retention of the heritage character of the City. But one had to be realistic and everything could not be put on the Council’s list; if there were too many and these were of dubious value, the quality of the list itself would be diluted.

The City Planner reported to the Council in September the Minister’s working party had recommended that there be “contributory items” or “Conservation Zones”. Mark Hamilton was the leader of pro-heritage faction controlling the Council and under his influence the ACC chose not to accept this advice and continued with its Townscape proposal. This added to the State’s growing concerns about the governance arrangements for the City and the direction the Council was taking. The City Planner was directed to redraft the DFC Statements as part of the 1991-96 City Plan with a new heading of ‘Townscape Context’. Hodgson considers the pro-development and pro-heritage groups each
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wanted the Planning Department to be an ally in its cause but his view was that the Department should provide impartial professional advice without fear or favour and not become influenced by either faction. Jose asserts Hamilton took the position the elected members had the responsibility for the Plan and the Planning Department had to write it as the elected members wanted. Indeed, Hamilton used his influence to direct and word-smith the work himself in quite a legalistic way (Jose, Jane ohi 45 / 60:63, Adelaide, 2 May 2008).

In November 1991 the Council adopted a “Register of City of Adelaide Contributory Townscape Items” which contained a schedule of the buildings, maps showing their location, the relevant wording in the draft Desired Future Character Statements and a proposal to expand the existing Heritage Principle. Hamilton was persistent and in December 1991 under his influence the Council requested the Minister for Environment and Planning to immediately amend the Act and provide for interim protection of these items considered to be of Townscape significance. A notice was placed in the Gazette that the Townscape exhibition would be open to the public from 10 December 1991 until 28 February 1992. Any representation was requested to be in the form of an argument about the quality of the building proposed for the Townscape Register.

The issue of the City’s heritage was important in the community and as a result of the Townscape exhibition 612 representations were received. 254 were in favour of listing, 316 were against, and 42 were ambivalent. In the Core and Frame Districts 116 were opposed and six were in favour; while in the Residential District 160 were opposed and 158 in favour. Of the general submissions not related to individual items, 41 were opposed and 90 in favour. The Council employed heritage consultants McDougall & Vines to review the representations. Building owners were advised they could be heard by a Townscape Advisory Group (TAG) which the Council would appoint, and that there would be a further exhibition of the proposals in September and October 1992. An unexpected consequence of the exhibition was that almost 700 new items were proposed for Townscape listing.

Under the Council’s commitment to a five-yearly planning cycle as part of its governance arrangement with the State the new 1991-96 City Plan should have been available at the end of 1991 after two years of review of the existing City Plan. However, with the majority of resources in the City Planner's
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Department devoted to the issue of Townscape, as one element of review, it was not until February 1992 that the City Planner recommended new strategic Objectives and Policies for the draft City of Adelaide Plan 1991-96. An important new Policy referred to ‘Distinctive areas incorporating Heritage buildings and important Townscapes in the Residential District’. In April Hamilton used his influence for the Council to appoint a working party of five to manage the remainder of the Plan Review process. Besides Hamilton himself, Councillors Rann, Douglas, Angove and Gillen were all from the pro-heritage faction. A proposal to also include Councillors Christodoulou and Moschakis (pro-development) was lost on factional lines.

Opposition in the community to the Townscape proposal continued to grow and the leaders of the two factions, Hamilton and Ninio, clashed in a Council meeting which was reported in The Advertiser (4 May 1992, p.44). Ninio described Hamilton as having “a born again fundamentalist attitude to the important and sensitive issue of heritage” while Hamilton described Ninio as “the leader of a small but noisy rump of anti-heritage members of Council using scare tactics to stir up the community.”

The City Planner, Hodgson, advised the Council that State officials were opposed to the way in which the ACC was proceeding with its Townscape proposal. The State’s position was to have State Heritage Items, Local Heritage Items and Historic Conservation Zones in the City. Nevertheless, at the May Council meeting, after much debate, it was decided to proceed with the Townscape proposal despite the known opposition from the State. Hamilton states (Hamilton, Mark, ohi 41 / 86:88, Adelaide, 9 May 2008):

I was passionate about what could be achieved in the 1991-96 City Plan because the pro-heritage members had the numbers on the Council for the first time and it was a rare opportunity to proceed.

Hamilton used his influence to try and ensure that every building arising from all of the assessments undertaken would be added to existing Heritage Register or would be part of the proposed statutory controls covering Townscape. Under the governance arrangements for the City the initial Townscape proposal was then referred to the Planning Commission for its consideration.

In June 1992 Hamilton arranged for the Council to engage Harry Bechervaise (the former City Planner) for the sum of $102,000 to give further advice on the Townscape proposal. Lord Mayor
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Condous and the pro-development faction opposed this expenditure as it had not been discussed with the then City Planner (Hodgson) and there was no advice from him about the implications.

The Plan Review Working Party organised an all day workshop on Friday 17 July and over 100 key stakeholders were invited to participate. Bechervaise suggested the underlying message of the new City Plan 1991-96 should be to promote the heritage of the City as a foundation stone for a better Adelaide with a title “Caring for the City”. “Townscape’ was one of the four themes proposed for the new Plan; the others were ‘Good Design’, ‘Housing’ and ‘Sustainable City’.

In early August the Council considered a report from the Townscape Advisory Groups who had held ten meetings and heard from 85 owners of buildings proposed to be listed. McDougall & Vines also provided a report on each of the buildings proposed for Townscape. As had occurred with the original list of Heritage items, if individual elected members owned any property that was affected they had to declare an interest and not vote. Such items had to be dealt with separately thus the elected member involved could declare his or her interest. By this means on 28 September 1992 the Council adopted the final “Register of City of Adelaide Designated Townscape Items” as a proposed amendment to the City of Adelaide Plan 1986-91 and the CAPC was requested to give consideration to the Register. In addition the Minister was requested to arrange early gazettal of the Register once the CAPC had approved it. All owners of the properties concerned were advised by the City Planner that their property had been retained on the Register, or deleted, or had been deferred for further consideration as a potential item in “Townscape II” which the Council was proposing.

Bannon resigned as Premier in September 1992 and Lynn Arnold became the new Premier. Arnold decided to split the Environment and Planning functions and created a new department of Planning and Urban Development with Greg Crafter replacing Lenehan as the Minister responsible for planning (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 71:73, Adelaide, 11 February 2008). Crafter, reflecting the concerns in the State, immediately took an interest in the Council’s Townscape proposal. He had been a Ministerial advisor to Dunstan and had a long history in ACC/State relations (Crafter, Greg, ohi 28 / 9:11, Adelaide, 18 February 2008). Crafter intervened in the governance of the City on 18 October 1992 and set up a joint City/State Forum to review the Townscape situation. He considered that the pro-heritage Council was not acting in the long term interests of the City; the State had a legitimate role to
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play in its development. Crafter chose not to use the CAPC for this role because its effectiveness as a joint body was already in decline as argued in Section 3.4.3.

The membership of the new joint body was Ray Bunker (Chairman), with Tom Muecke, Michael Lennon, David Ellis and John Ellis representing the State. Councillors Jim Crawford, Jane Rann and Alan Rye and the City Manager represented the ACC. The City Planner provided a paper to the Forum in September 1992 with a possible approach but it soon became clear from the State members that there was not going to be a Townscape Register with groups of buildings, but rather a Local Heritage List of individual items. Thus groups of buildings would not be protected, only individual buildings. 234

Councillor Henry Ninio at the Council meeting in October asked whether the economic impact of the Townscape proposals on values and rate revenue, particularly in the Core and Frame Districts, had been considered. He then proposed that all the Townscape proposals be held in abeyance pending discussion with the State and the outcome of the Forum to allay the growing concerns in the community about Townscape. Ninio and the pro-development faction used a public relations consultant to prepare an open letter signed by Ninio and the other five Councillors of the faction expressing concerns about the Townscape proposal and the impact it would have on the development of the City. It was sent to owners of all the additional properties proposed for listing. Ninio saw Townscape as the major political issue for his campaign to run as Lord Mayor in the next Council election in May 1993. 235

Hamilton was concerned at the Minister’s intervention and at the next Council meeting Hamilton again used his influence to request the CAPC to immediately consider an amendment to the statutory provisions of the City Plan 1986–91 to include the Townscape Register. The decision was made on factional lines, ten votes to six. 236 However, the CAPC (bearing in mind only three Commissioners were members of the Council’s pro-heritage faction) deferred making a decision until the findings of the City/State Forum were available.

While the proposed Townscape Register was effectively in abeyance the City Planner’s Department was continuing assessment of the additional items that had been proposed for listing under
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Townscape II. However, because of inconsistencies between the DFC Statements and the retention of buildings, the City Planner was influential in persuading the Council that about two thirds of Townscape II should be deleted. But in early November the Council decided the remaining items of Townscape II would be exhibited for public comment. As a result of the Townscape II exhibition, 127 owners requested to be heard while 61 did not, only 10 representations were in favour, the remainder were opposed, mainly on the grounds of a decrease in property value and restrictions on what could be done on the land. In particular BOMA had strong objections to Townscape II perceiving there was no balance between economic realities and listing and it was therefore a \textit{de facto} heritage list.

There was much informal intense discussion within the Council and the pro-heritage faction recognised the political reality of Minister Crafter’s position.\textsuperscript{237} It was clear the State had a different view about Townscape and Premier Arnold did not want the economic development of the Adelaide impeded with any uncertainties about what could be done in the City (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 38:40, Adelaide, 11 February 2008). Consequently the ACC at its meeting on 15 December 1992 adopted the City Planner’s recommendations which effectively recognised there would be no statutory controls to protect the heritage of the City in terms of Townscape, but there would be protection for Local Heritage Items. Details of the ACC report sent to Crafter are included in Appendix 24.

Minister Crafter reduced the proposed list of 1492 Local Heritage Items by 150 wherein the respective owner had decided to object to listing. This was an outcome which disregarded the heritage significance of the property and in Jose’s view was a quite extraordinary political decision given that due process had been followed by the Council (Jose, Jane, ohi 45 / 39:42, Adelaide, 2 May 2008). Mosler (2006, p.129) asserts it was never envisaged that owners could simply ask for a property to be delisted which had been placed on the list after professional and independent assessment.

In April 1993 the Planning Commission endorsed 1342 Local Heritage Items as part of the draft \textit{City of Adelaide Plan 1991–96}. The CAPC noted that a further 400 items were still being assessed by the City/State Forum established by the Minister. The pro-heritage Council made a substantial commitment to its policy position about the importance of the heritage of the City and included $1 million in the ACC budget for incentives in the management of Local Heritage Items.

\textsuperscript{237} The researcher was party to most of these discussions and was able to exercise some influence. As a result the City Planner was requested to prepare a further report for the Council recommending the listing of Local Heritage Items.
The ASER proposal by the State had tested the governance arrangement with the City but ACC/State relations had survived as discussed in Chapter 3.3. It has been argued in this Section the Council’s Townscape proposal challenged the governance arrangements to the extent that it was a contributing factor in the State’s decision to end the separate system of planning in the City which resulted from the State Planning Review. This is examined in detail in the next Section.

3.4.6 THE STATE PLANNING REVIEW

In this Section the State Planning Review is examined and the reasons which led to the integration of the City’s system into the State’s new system arising from the Review are analysed.

Premier Bannon was influential in the development of the State during the 1980s (Parkin & Patience, 1992). He combined the Savings Bank of South Australia (founded in 1848) and the State Bank of South Australia (founded in 1896) to form the new State Bank and this was part of a substantial period of expansion in Adelaide (Martin 2009, p.115). Bannon also created the South Australian Finance Authority to assist the private sector with developments (Mosler 2006, p.19). Further, he brought about the ASER development, despite opposition from the Council, and secured the Grand Prix motor race for Adelaide with the support of the Council (Martin 2009, p.117).

However, by the late 1980s there was mounting public criticism of the Bannon Government that it was failing to deliver major projects and it was perceived the planning system was to blame. The Government saw the existing planning system as not serving the community well and it was the philosophy of control behind the City’s Act and the Planning Act, 1982 that was the problem. There had been a perception in the 1960s and 1970s that Government under Dunstan’s influence could bring about change and achieve reform through legislation. This attitude had changed and what was needed was legislation with some vision which empowered communities and facilitated rather than controlled development (Crafter, Greg, ohi 28 / 21:25, Adelaide, 18 February 2008).

At a regular meeting between the Premier and the Lord Mayor, Bannon advised there was going to be a State Planning Review which would include the City. Bannon also indicated to Condous the State
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would appoint a Reference Group to assist in this Review but, as Local Government would have a representative on the Reference Group, there would be no separate ACC representation.239

Bannon announced publicly in March 1990 there would be a State Planning Review. The Terms of Reference for the Review are included as Appendix 25. Brian Hayes recalls he was invited by the Premier to chair the Planning Review and the other members were Stephen Hamnett and Paul Edwards. But Paul Edwards soon left for Britain and he was replaced by Graeme Bethune. Michael Lennon was appointed by the Premier as the Review Director (Hayes, Brain ohi 46 / 32:35, Adelaide, 12 May 2008). Bannon recalls he accepted the advice of Lennon that a “20/20 Vision” was needed for the State and the review should include the City (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 107:110, Adelaide, 5 February 2008).

Jose considers that a contributing factor for the Planning Review was the growing perception in the State that the Council was anti-development and only interested in the retention of Adelaide’s character. She thinks the State had come to the view that there had to be a significant change in the City, rather than trying to create change within the existing system (Jose, Jane, ohi 45 / 92:94, Adelaide, 2 May 2008).

I argue that the Government had already taken the position that the City would no longer be treated separately. Hamnett takes the view that the Terms of Reference were important as they set the agenda and the decision was taken at a broad philosophical level to integrate the City into a new system well before any technical issues were considered. The Premier’s influence was clear from the start that he wanted to simplify all relevant planning legislation (Hamnett, Steve, ohi 47/ 45:46, Adelaide, 6 May 2008). However, at the next regular meeting between the Premier and Lord Mayor it was agreed the City Planner would liaise with Lennon to ensure there was a coordinated approach to the City Plan review and the State Planning Review, particularly over the issue of the City’s heritage.240

Hamnett advises an early working position paper (unpublished) had been prepared entitled “Planning, Building and Development Control”. This had contained a specific section on the City and its
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separate legislation. It highlighted the joint CAPC compared to the SA Planning Commission which was purely a State body. The issue was raised of the lack of third party appeals and the complexity of administering the City’s system. The fact that the Council’s Plan was conceived separately from the rest of the State was seen as a manifestation of a separatist attitude which was often criticised. The view was expressed that there seemed to be little justification for the continued existence of parallel systems and that the advantages that did accrue were all in favour of the Council. Some of the policies in the City’s plan, such as the Council’s approach to car parking, did not fit well with the transportation policies of the State. It was concluded in the position paper that there were aspects of the City’s system that could prove a useful model for the rest of the State. The innovative “Desired Future Character Statements” were becoming an accepted part of some other Council Development Plans as qualitative statutory controls (Hamnett, Steve, ohi 47 / 51:66, Adelaide, 6 May 2008).

Ferretti (2003) examined the State Planning Review as a case study. She argues the individuals in the Reference Group, especially Hugh Stretton, were influential in the approach taken to the future of the metropolitan area. Lennon recalls interesting and entertaining debates in the Reference Group where Stretton provided the intellectual base (Lennon, Michael, ohi 35 / 142:146, Melbourne, 19 April 2008). Bannon had been persuaded to not only look at reviewing the statutory development control system, but to integrate it with a strategic planning approach which offered a vision for the future. This was not new; it had been the case in the City in 1972 when Stretton had then been an influence on Dunstan and Hayes as examined in Chapter 3.1.

Bannon observes in relation to the City’s separate system (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 107:110, Adelaide, 5 February 2008):

> There had always been developers who could not understand the need for two systems, and those who were ‘picky’ and did not think the City should be treated differently from any other Council.

In a submission to the State Planning Review BOMA expressed the view the City was a State asset and its development should be overseen by a body with appropriate skills and expertise rather than by Councillors primarily representing the residential Wards of the City (BOMA News vol.3, no.6 December 1991, p.6). The RAIA (SA) and RAPI (SA) both requested the Premier to ensure the State’s role in the CBD would be taken into account in the Planning Review and in any new governance arrangements.241
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Arnold also recalls business was finding the planning system a labyrinth and too hard to deal with, particularly as the City had a separate and different system. Cabinet was regularly briefed by Lennon and became excited about the State Planning Review and the idea of a "whole of State 20/20 Vision" when the State was City-dominated (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24/ 64:69, Adelaide, 11 February 2008).

A report to the Reference Group examined the relative strengths and weaknesses of the City’s separate planning system with the Planning Act, 1982. The Reference Group agreed the best features of each should be adopted in the new legislation. Work on the Planning Review had progressed to the point that in January 1991 Bannon announced there would be a new planning system which would remove delays and provide better coordination between the City and the rest of the metropolitan area. The City Manager persuaded the Council to hold a workshop to discuss the direction the State Planning Review was taking and its likely impact on the City. Lennon was invited to attend and he outlined what was envisaged for the City.

The Council consequently decided a submission should be made to the Planning Review. The ACC submission was prepared by all the Heads of Departments under the leadership of the City Planner (given the City Manager was on the Reference Group as an individual). Hodgson had been persuaded of the merits of the City’s separate system as described earlier and he structured the submission on the basis of the implications for the City in the following areas:

- Urban consolidation
- Heritage
- Major projects
- Strategic planning
- Employment
- Public transport
- Parking
- Housing

It was commented in the draft submission it was important to recognise that the quality of life and economic viability of the metropolitan area and the City were mutually inter-dependent. There was criticism of the State’s view that the rationale for a separate Act appeared to have gone, especially as the advantages of the City’s system were identified but not any deficiencies. The introduction of third
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party appeal rights appeared to be contrary to the aim of speeding up the planning process. The role of the CAPC as a joint body and the importance of the CBD were ignored by the State. The submission was endorsed by the Council in August and forwarded to the Premier.244

However, in late November 1991 Bannon announced that a draft Development Bill was being prepared which would replace the Planning Act, Building Act, City of Adelaide Development Control Act, Heritage Act and the land division provisions of the Real Property Act. The Council immediately organised a further workshop (at Ayers House on Sunday 15 December) and again invited Lennon to attend and explain the State’s position. He made it clear the Council should be in no doubt of the State’s intentions and the City would be a part of the new State system; the separate governance arrangements the ACC had enjoyed since 1972 would cease.245

In the late 1980s there was a collapse of regional economies in Australia. The institutions which had carried Adelaide for over 150 years, such as Elders and the Bank of Adelaide, all disappeared in a very short period of time becoming part of the national/international economy. There was also a major reform of the public sector and the nature of the central city changed. Lennon observes it was difficult to persuade the ACC that the City was under serious threat, despite the manifestations of increasing vacancy rates and declining property values. The argument in the Planning Review was whether action could be taken to reinvigorate the City by policy and institutional devices. The policy framework put forward was that the City was an essential part of the metropolitan area and the State had a legitimate interest in the governance of, and strategy for, the City. In the 1970s the innovative joint City/State City of Adelaide Planning Commission had played this role and the City then had arguably a higher level of planning expertise than the State. The expertise at the State level was mostly in the statutory approach inherited from Hart. Outside the City “planning” was seen by the State as being no more than the control of development and there no sense of any integration with strategy or direction (Lennon, Michael, ohi 35 / 113:116, Melbourne, 19 April, 2008).

Lennon provided a briefing to the Reference Group before the final report of the State Planning Review was forwarded to the Premier. The report contained the 20/20 Vision; a Bill for the Development Act; and Regulations under the Act. While the political realities of the situation were recognised it was of concern to the Council that the State was proposing to substitute the City’s concise Act, which had proven effective in operation, with new legislation which was untested and
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complex. It was considered the new Development Act would adversely affect the quality of development control in the City rather than improve it.246

Smith considers there were political, technical and professional reasons why the State formed the view that the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 should be repealed and the City integrated into the State system. The main technical reason was the recommendation from the Planning Review that the Planning Act and the Building Act should be amalgamated into a new Development Act. Thus if the City’s separate Act continued there would be a problem with the Building Act in the City. The old Building Act would have to be retained for the City alone or the City’s Act would have to be amended to bring in the relevant building provisions of the new Development Act. There would then be two Planning Acts and two Building Acts applying in the State which was not desirable. From the State’s perspective the value of a joint City/State body had ceased and a decision was made to have only one piece of legislation covering both planning and building throughout the whole State, including the City (Smith, Phil, ohi 36 / 47:57, Adelaide, 8 April 2008).

Hamnett asserts the integration of strategic and statutory planning approaches had evolved in local government over time as planning expertise and resources had become available to other Councils in South Australia. Desired Future Character Statements were going to be part of all Council Development Plans under the new legislation based on the model in Adelaide thereby transposing a City innovation onto the State level. Thus in the State Planning Review it was accepted the City’s system had a wider application to other Councils and this was seen as a sensible progression (Hamnett, Steve, ohi 47 / 31:35, Adelaide, 6 May 2008).

Payze considers the relationship between the City and State and the influence of the Council since the 1970s changed over the twenty year period. The State needed to provide a new framework for planning the metropolitan area having regard to population growth, transport accessibility and social needs. Adelaide was different from the other capital cities with its dominance of the metropolitan area but by the 1990s the State did not need a separate governance arrangement for the City; it needed to be integrated (Payze, Rod, ohi 44 / 40:49, Hyde Park, 19 May 2008).

Smith also observes that by the early 1990s several pieces of State legislation had been inserted into the City’s Act and it was in need of a major overhaul. There was also some concern for planning

246 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Corporate Services File 3704, part 5.
professionals. Planning issues and court judgements about developments which were common to the rest of the State did not apply in the City. Thus Planners could move between Councils and to and from the State planning agency but this did not include planners in the City because they were working in a different system. There was some insularity about the City having its own legislation and this was part of the perceived culture that the City was a different place. The State Government came to the conclusion a system within a system was too difficult to control and it needed to be changed (Smith, Phil, oh! 36 / 61: 71, Adelaide, 8 April 2008).

Teague, from the State planning agency, wrote to the Council in late February 1992 and advised that it was intended that the Council’s *City of Adelaide Plan 1991–96*, which was yet to be finalised, would become a Development Plan for the City under transitional arrangements of the new legislation. Consequently the Council considered that an urgent response was required to the draft State legislation and set up a working party consisting of Deputy Lord Mayor Hamilton and Councillors Rann, Gillen and, in an effort to be bi-partisan, Ninio from the pro-development faction. In April the Council adopted the Working Party’s Report which was primarily about the ongoing governance of the City and the continuation of the CAPC, but it also included a detailed analysis by the City Planner of the technical aspects of the Bill and its deficiencies.

Hamilton tried to influence Minister Lenehan to retain the CAPC on the basis of the governance benefits of the City’s system and he also met with Lennon in May to see whether some form of compromise could be reached. At the Council meeting later in May Hamilton, as the Deputy Lord Mayor (rather than Lord Mayor Condous who was off-side with the pro-heritage Council), was authorised to pursue the matter of the CAPC directly with the Premier. Condous was later to call on the State to intervene directly in the City’s affairs because of the pro-heritage Council’s position on Townscape for which he was formally censured by the Council.

Bannon declined to meet with Hamilton and in June the ACC directed Hamilton and the City Manager “to pursue required amendments to the Development Bill by whatever means possible”. It was considered the ACC might still be able to exercise some influence in the Legislative Council when the legislation was eventually considered. Lennon informed the Council in July that the State regarded

---

247 The researcher had been present at a meeting of the Reference Group before the final report was forwarded to the Premier. It was obvious the State Planning Review had a firm position and the only possibility was a direct approach to the Premier.

the City as the commercial and cultural heart of the State and that role was supported. However, there was now a need to integrate the planning systems and the City’s Act would be repealed. Lennon also advised that there would be a consultation process on the draft legislation for eight weeks to facilitate public discussion and seek specific responses and a further submission from the ACC would be welcomed.249

After the public exhibition had closed Lennon briefed the Council again at the end of August. The City Planner then prepared a final submission which the Council adopted and forwarded to the State. The main ACC concerns were still about governance arrangements for the City and how the integration of strategic and statutory approaches to planning would be achieved. These specific concerns were identified as:

- The mechanisms for coordination of Council and State strategic planning, and capital investment, to ensure that agreed strategies are effectively put into practice.

- The implications of the proposed new integrated development legislation for the efficiency and effectiveness of development control in the City.250

In Lennon’s view (Lennon, Michael, ohi 35 / 62:67, Melbourne, 19 April, 2008) the Development Act, 1993 resulting from the Planning Review was an attempt to frame legislation in political and economic terms. It was a pragmatic and practical effort to identify the interests in the planning system and was designed so that there was a separation of roles. The intention was to create a hierarchy of interests of the constituencies being served. If the application was only of local and neighbourhood significance then the Council could deal with it. But if there were higher issues, then the application needed to be referred upwards. These were exactly the roles of the ACC and the CAPC for the governance of the City under its own Act and thus the City’s innovative and different planning system became a partial model for the State.

It was envisaged that the new Planning Strategy for the metropolitan area would guide the framing of all Council Development Plans. The format of the Development Plans would be ‘Issues’, ‘Objectives’ and ‘Principles’. Thus there would be an integration of strategic and statutory approaches which had been in the City’s separate system since 1972; again, this represents the transferral of a successful planning innovation at the City level into a generic State expectation and requirement.251 The draft Bill

---

249 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Corporate Services’ File 3704, part 5.
250 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Corporate Services File 3704, part 6.
251 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Corporate Services File 3704, part 8.
proposed the separation of policy and development control with the creation of two new State bodies – the Development Policy Advisory Committee (DPAC) and the Development Assessment Commission (DAC).\textsuperscript{252} It is argued this proposal resulted directly from the innovative work of Mant and Llewellyn-Smith in the City in 1976 and the influence they had in the separation of strategic and statutory planning into different components, but their integration in one document; the \textit{City of Adelaide Plan, 1976-81}, and in all subsequent five-yearly City Plans.

At the close of the State Planning Review Lennon became the CEO of the new Department of Planning and Urban Development with responsibility for assisting Minister Crafter to pass the new legislation in the Parliament.\textsuperscript{253}

Crafter said in Parliament when he introduced the Bill for the \textit{Development Act, 1993}:

\begin{quote}
The City of Adelaide will now become subject to the same development legislation as the rest of the State. I would like to acknowledge the work of the Review Team of Brian Hayes, Stephen Hamnett and Graeme Bethune. They have met the brief of designing a planning system which can take Adelaide and South Australia into the twenty first century. It is now our responsibility to give legislative form to the results of the comprehensive review process.\textsuperscript{254}
\end{quote}

Arnold considers Crafter did an excellent job of navigating the new legislation through the Parliament. The ACC had clearly wanted to retain its separate system, but it no longer had the influence in the Legislative Council it once had. Indeed, the Australian Democrats (Ian Gilfillan and Mike Elliot) then held the balance of power and had a lot to say about the planning issues. But the Liberal Opposition, after some minor amendments, supported the Bill (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 11:20, Adelaide, 11 February 2008). The Parliament passed the legislation on 5 May 1993.\textsuperscript{255} Just as Wotton had taken the view that Parliament had passed the \textit{Planning Act, 1982} and he was just bringing it into effect while the Government was in caretaker mode, Smith thinks it was a superb irony that exactly the same thing happened with the \textit{Development Act, 1993}. It was enacted by Arnold’s Labor Government while in caretaker mode on 5 December 1993 and consequently the City’s Act was repealed thus ending twenty-one years of an innovative and different approach to city planning (Smith, Phil, ohi 36/103:105, Adelaide, 8 April 2008). Arnold was effectively a caretaker Premier until the election on 11 December 1993 when there was an enormous loss for the ALP and Dean Brown became the new Liberal Premier (Martin 2009, pp.135-137).
The City lost its innovative and different separate system of planning for a number of reasons which have been examined and analysed in this Section. Cabinet considered the pro-heritage Council was ‘dragging the chain’ in terms of development and holding the State back. The City’s culture was that Adelaide was a different place but the nature of the elected members on the Council had changed since 1984 (when the Local Government Act was amended) and it no longer represented the major business interests in the City. The City’s successful planning model would be a sensible progression to other Councils which had acquired planning expertise. Thus it no longer made sense to have one system inside the Park Lands and another planning system on the other side. Indeed, the two pieces of planning legislation had fundamentally become similar and lawyers argued there should be a single planning jurisdiction. The State needed a new policy framework because the CBD was important to the whole State, not just the Council, and within the metropolitan context the City was under economic threat, especially in the area of retailing. There were no third party appeals and were no interim development control powers in the City. In the next Section changing leadership in the State and the City is analysed which was another reason, albeit minor, Adelaide was integrated into a new State system.

3.4.7 CHANGES IN THE LEADERSHIP OF THE STATE AND THE COUNCIL

This Section examines the change from Bannon to Arnold as Premier in September 1992, and Condous to Ninio as Lord Mayor in July 1993. There were some implications for the ACC/State relationship and the governance of the City resulting from these changes.

Bannon was Premier for most of the period Condous was Lord Mayor. Condous considered he had a good working relationship with Bannon and they had regular monthly meetings alternating between the Premier’s Office (in Victoria Square or Parliament House) and the Lord Mayor’s Room. Even if they did not agree about something they would walk away feeling a compromise had been reached (Condous, Steve, ohi 30 / 85:87, Norwood, 1 March 2008).

However, Bannon reflects his relationship with Condous was quite difficult. Condous was more of a “populist” Lord Mayor than the other Lord Mayors Bannon had dealt with (Watson, Chapman and Jarvis). The problem was Condous wanted to be agreeable to everyone. This made it hard when there were difficult issues and tough decisions to be made. Often the last person to speak to him influenced him. One example was the proposed demolition of the Tram Barns in Hackney Road
adjacent to the Adelaide Botanic Garden. While it was not a unanimous decision in Cabinet, Bannon had summed up all the issues, including the heritage value of what was left of the Tram Barns. Bannon was able to influence a majority of Cabinet and it was decided demolition was justified, particularly as the new Tropical Conservatory in the Garden had been designed and built on the basis of all the Tram Barns on the site being cleared (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 70:76, Adelaide, 5 February 2008).

The National Trust expressed opposition to the proposal for the demolition of the Tram Barns (Mosler 2006, p.156). Lenehan recalls this was a major issue during her term as Minister. One view in Cabinet was that all the Tram Barns should be demolished as this had been part of the original brief for the Tropical Conservatory which set the new building in open Park Lands of the Garden; it should be seen in the setting for which it was designed. The Council at the time was divided on pro-development and pro-heritage lines, but under Hamilton’s influence the Council’s position was to keep at least one of the Tram Barns and demolish the others. Lenehan had regard to her Department’s advice and came to the view that the removal of the Tram Barns should be opposed and she had argued for their retention (Lenehan, Susan, ohi 27 / 21:24, Adelaide, 7 March 2008).

Bannon had been in constant touch with Condous about the issue. Condous had assured Bannon of his support and that he could not see any heritage value in the Tram Barns either. However, one day Bannon was driving along Hackney Road to a function and a crowd was gathered outside the Tram Barns protesting against their demolition. Bannon remembers (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 81:83, Adelaide, 5 February 2008):

There was Condous on a soapbox addressing the crowd saying ‘No demolition’. I could not believe the Lord Mayor had changed his views.

Lenehan also recalls that Condous, who had been initially supportive of total demolition, changed his mind and this influenced the City and State to reach a compromise where one Tram Barn building remained (Figure 38) but the others were demolished (Lenehan, Susan, ohi 27 /24:26, Adelaide, 7 March 2008).

Bannon observes there was a ‘cat and mouse game’ over Condous’ possible candidature for a seat in State Parliament. There were rumours that the Liberal Party had persuaded Condous to stand but he had assured Bannon privately he was not going to. But the rumours persisted and Bannon felt very
let down when Condous finally announced he was going to run as the Liberal candidate for the seat of Colton (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 70:93, Adelaide, 5 February 2008).

Arnold recalls that Bannon assured Cabinet that Condous would not run for a seat in Parliament when he retired as Lord Mayor but when he did emerge as a Liberal candidate this made things difficult between the City and the State (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 50:52, Adelaide, 11 February 2008). Bannon considers that if Condous had been upfront about his intentions something might have been worked out. But the relationship was fractured and, as Premier, Bannon no longer knew if he was dealing with the Lord Mayor or a Liberal candidate and therefore could not be open about things. Thus the regular monthly meetings, which had started with Premier Tonkin and Lord Mayor Watson, would have to cease. This was a pity as there was no longer a way of dealing with ACC/State issues through their personal influences and in Bannon’s view the governance of the City would suffer (Bannon, John, ohi 23 / 70:93, Adelaide, 5 February 2008).

In January 1991 there were rumours about the financial stability of the State Bank and Bannon engaged J P Morgan to assess the Bank’s position, as well as commissioning a report from the Auditor-General. It was found the State was guarantee for the Bank and $970 million was needed immediately to cover the losses (Martin 2009, p.131). The State Bank collapsed and a Royal Commission was appointed. In August 1992 it was reported that there had been mismanagement, recklessness and negligence rather than corruption. More than $3 billion was needed to bail out the

256 The researcher was present at the meeting when Bannon expressed this view and advised the Lord Mayor he would no longer meet with him.
Bank. Bannon, in his role as Treasurer, claimed he had no idea about the extent of the problem as he had remained at arm's length from the management of the Bank.

The Royal Commissioner into the State Bank collapse, (Hon) Samuel Jacobs, commented “the Bank and the Bank group failed because it made too many loans that it should never have made, loans were high risk, beyond a level acceptable to a prudent banker”. Bannon resigned as Premier in September 1992 over the State Bank collapse. Lynn Arnold became the new Premier and the leader of an insecure and minority government (Martin 2009, p.133). Arnold actively pursued the State Planning Review, directed by Lennon, and it was the subject of much discussion in Cabinet. Arnold’s aim was to have a planning system with appropriate controls but minimum regulation (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 19:21, Adelaide, 11 February 2008).

Condous recalls (Condous, Steve, ohi 30 / 92:94, Norwood, 1 March 2008) that when Arnold became Premier after Bannon resigned in September 1992 Condous tried to re-establish a relationship with the new Premier. There were two meetings with Arnold in Parliament House during the period until May 1993 when Condous retired, but they only lasted about ten minutes. In Condous’ view Arnold was not interested in City/State relations as by this time it appeared the State had decided to have a new planning system. Arnold advises (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 51:53, Adelaide, 11 February 2008):

> I had little contact with the Lord Mayor as Condous was the Liberal candidate for the State seat of Colton and this made any meeting difficult.

It was widely expected that Hamilton and Ninio would contest the Lord Mayoralty in the May 1993 elections as the respective leaders of the pro-heritage and pro-development factions. However, close to the election Hamilton unexpectedly decided not to be a candidate. Hamilton states (Hamilton, Mark ohi 41 / 94:96, Adelaide, 9 May 2008):

> My legal firm had become part of Finlaysons and they had an extensive range of clients. This meant I would have had too many conflicts of interests.

With no other candidate from the pro-heritage faction, Ninio became Lord Mayor unopposed. Ninio had never chaired a Council committee and had never served in one of the senior positions of Aldermen. He had no background in the successive City Plans and the governance of the City; his whole approach to Townscape was that development at any cost was good. Ninio, as a small businessman in Rundle Mall, was perceived to be a supporter of the Liberal Party. However, on a

---

visit to London with Ninio in July 1993 it became clear to the researcher that Ninio was a card carrying member of the Labor Party and he had close relationships with several Cabinet Ministers, particularly Crafter. 258

Teague considers the Council changed after Condous retired. Ninio, the new Lord Mayor, and the pro-development Council seemed to be persuaded about the merits of combining the planning and building controls in the proposed new legislation and were not opposed to it (Teague, Bob, ohi 37 / 77:79, Adelaide, 24 April 2008).

Arnold thinks the relationship between the State and the City had been one of defensiveness on behalf of the Council when the pro-heritage faction was in charge. However, things changed under Ninio when the pro-development members had the majority in the new Council in May 1993. Arnold comments he personally got on well with Ninio as he was equally keen on promoting economic development in the City (Arnold, Lynn, ohi 24 / 56:59, Adelaide, 11 February 2008). With Arnold as Premier and Ninio as Lord Mayor, who were both committed to the development of the City with minimum planning restrictions, it was politically inevitable the nature of the governance of the City would change and the separate system would cease.

In this Section the changes in the leadership of the State and the City have been examined. While a minor factor, these political changes did contribute to the repeal of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976. The next Section describes the adoption of the City of Adelaide Plan, 1991-96 while the Act was still in force.

3.4.8 THE CITY OF ADELAIDE PLAN 1991-96

In this Section the nature of the City of Adelaide Plan 1991-96 adopted by the pro-heritage Council is examined. The Objectives and Policies were endorsed in November 1992 and the consequential statutory elements were considered by the CAPC and gazetted in July 1993. Thus the integration of strategic and statutory approaches to planning the City through the Planning Commission was continued in this final City Plan.

258 An invitation had been received from the City of London for all the Australian Capital City Lord Mayors and CEOs to visit London in July 1993. Ninio, as the new Lord Mayor, and the researcher accepted the invitation and attended.
The original work programme for the Plan Review included an assessment of the numerical standards related to the built form of the City; uses in the Western Service Precinct; potential of the West Terrace Precinct; distribution of welfare housing and institutional needs; new Residential Development Strategy; additions to the City of Adelaide Heritage Register and a review of the Character Schedule (Townscape).\footnote{259 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Corporate Services File 1487, part 21.} However, as examined in Section 3.4.5, when the pro-heritage faction gained control of the Council in May 1991 all the emphasis in the Review was placed on the protection of the City’s heritage and the importance of Townscape.

Hamilton recalls that when he became the Deputy Lord Mayor and responsible for the Review of the City Plan 1986-91 leading to the adoption of the City Plan 1991–96, he played a “hands on” role. He wanted to see an increase in the number of heritage listed buildings as well as a substantial strengthening of the DFC Statements in terms of design requirements and the protection of Townscape. Hamilton was keen on a fine grain approach to the planning of the City on a Precinct by Precinct basis (Hamilton, Mark, ohi 41 / 86:89, Adelaide, 9 May 2008).

The issue of Townscape, which became a list of Local Heritage Items, dominated debate in the formulation of the City Plan 1991-96 (CCoA 1992, p.5). While the politics of a separate system were still being argued between the Council and the State, at the administrative level the City Planner maintained close liaison with the State Planning Review to ensure the Principles of Development Control could provide the basis for the Development Plan for the City in terms of the proposed new legislation.

The City Plan 1991–96 placed greater emphasis on the need to preserve Adelaide’s heritage and for new development to be of good design quality. The introduction of the Local Heritage List and the inclusion of strengthened design requirements for new development were a significant milestone in the protection of the heritage of Colonel Light’s plan for the City and the enhancement of Adelaide’s character (CCoA 1992, p.7).

Davis observes the nature of the Planning Commission at the time was such that reports on the review of the City Plan were just received and noted rather being debated and a position taken

After consideration by the CAPC in terms of the governance arrangements, the amended *Principles of Development Control* were gazetted. They included a widespread introduction of a bonus plot ratio for residential development in the Core and Frame Districts. This Plan was the fourth and final one under the provisions of the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976* and only continued until the Act was repealed in December 1993 with the *Principles* becoming the transitional Development Plan for the City (CCoA 1992, p.9). The Regulations under the Act provided for Schedule 1 to be the Register of the City of Adelaide Heritage Items and for Schedule 2 to be the Register of Local Heritage Items (CCoA 1992, pp.321-344).

Despite the fact that in November 1992 the Council was well aware the City Plan was likely to be in operation for only a limited time, it was decided to publish the *City of Adelaide Plan 1991–96* in the same square format as all the previous City Plans (‘The Blue, Green and Grey Books’) and the *City of Adelaide Planning Study* (USC, 1974) (‘The Red Book’). This time white was chosen as the colour for the cover. While white usually signifies purity and peace, it is also the colour of truce and surrender (Kohl 1998). The last City Plan became known as ‘The White Book’ and this was particularly appropriate as the Council gave up its independent planning status and the City became absorbed into the new system of State planning. This publication completed a distinctive suite of documents for an innovative and different system of city planning which I argue is unique in the planning heritage of Australia. The integration of strategic and statutory elements continued in one document and the last City Plan was structured in eight Parts as follows:

- Part 1 – Objectives
- Part 2 – Policies
- Part 3 – Principles of Development Control
- Part 4 – Desired Future Character Statements
- Part 5 – Schedule of Transferable Floor Area provisions
- Part 6 – *City of Adelaide Development Control Act*
- Part 7 – Regulations under the Act
- Part 8 – Action Projects

There were four important joint City/State Action Projects identified in Part 8. These were a review of Rundle Mall to boost its activity levels; a residential and commercial redevelopment of the East End

---

260 Adelaide City Archives. Department of Planning and Development File D3052, part 23.
Markets (Figure 39); the enhancement of North Terrace as a special cultural and educational place; and the relocation of the Council’s Halifax Street Works Depot which provided a six acre (2.43 hectare) site for dense well-designed new housing (CCoA 1992, pp.349-359).

![Figure 39 – The redeveloped East End Markets (Heritage façade retained with new residential development behind) Source: Researcher](image)

After the May 1993 elections the pro-development faction had the majority on the new Council. As described in Section 3.4.3, Ninio, Christodolou, Rann and Douglas were nominated to the Planning Commission for the last few months of its operation. Payze, Ellis, Marsland and Beasley remained as the State members. During the period from July to December 1993 the CAPC continued its statutory role and dealt with two major projects; the East End Markets redevelopment in South Adelaide (as above) and the Le Cornu site in North Adelaide. Details of these two projects are provided in Appendix 26.

Hamilton observes the loss of the joint City/State body, the CAPC, meant the nature of the governance arrangements for the City changed. Instead of being separate and different the Development Plan for the City took on a standard format and Adelaide was treated like any other Council. The special relationship which had existed between the City and State since their foundation

---

in 1836 was gone forever and in his opinion this was not in the best interests of the City (Hamilton, Mark, ohi 41 / 97:103, Adelaide, 9 May 2008).

This Section has examined the adoption of the City Plan 1991-96. It was only in operation for a few months but it was important as it provided inter alia for statutory controls for Local Heritage Places which evolved from the long and divisive debate over Townscape in the Council. The statutory controls became the transitional Development Plan for the City in December 1993.

3.4.9 SUMMARY

This Chapter has addressed the Research Question:

What were the important factors in the repeal of the Act in 1993 when Adelaide was integrated into a new State system partially based on the City's approach?

The decline in the importance the City of Adelaide Planning Commission was examined and analysed. It was argued this began when Lord Mayor Condous became Chairman of the Commission. At the administrative level McPhail (Director of Environment and Planning) was influential in the State's dominance in the CAPC and ensured the City was seen as part of the metropolitan area and not independent of it. The divisive debate about Townscape, within the context of the heritage of City, was of major concern to the State, particularly when the pro-heritage faction gained control of the Council in 1991. It was further argued this was one of the reasons the City was included in State Planning Review initiated by Premier Bannon. Deputy Lord Mayor Hamilton exerted considerable political influence within the Council to try and maintain the heritage of the City. Minister Lenehan had some influence on this issue from the State's perspective. Arising from the State Planning Review and under the influence of Premier Arnold new legislation was proposed and passed. The Development Act, 1993 entailed the repeal of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 and it was argued there were political, technical and professional reasons for this. The Council had lost its influence in the Legislative Council to maintain the City's independent position. Indeed Lord Mayor Ninio, elected in May 1993, was a member of the Labor Party and supported the City being integrated into the State's new system which, it has been asserted, was partially based on the City's model. In December 1993, after twenty-one years, the innovative and different system of planning and development control for the City of Adelaide came to an end.
PART FOUR

Conclusions, References and Appendices
CHAPTER 4.1

Conclusions; *heritage, influence, governance and integration*

The arguments and Research Questions addressed - Pluralism and Identity-based politics - What was discovered - The success of the Adelaide model - Lessons learned - Possible future Research Questions arising from this inquiry

4.1.1 INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter containing conclusions the researcher addresses the arguments advanced in the thesis in relation to the four themes and two core research questions which emerged from the research.

These four themes were:

. the *heritage* of the City arising from Colonel Light’s original plan in 1836, particularly the Park Lands

. the *influence* of key individuals in terms of the City/State relationship

. the *governance* of the City with reference to the respective powers of the City and State

. the *integration* of strategic and statutory planning approaches.

The two core research questions were:

. In general, why was the City of Adelaide able to have an innovative and different approach to city planning and development control from 1972 until 1993?

. In particular, what were the important factors in the introduction of Interim Development Control for the City in October 1972; in the operation of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 from March 1977; and in the repeal of this legislation in December 1993 when Adelaide was integrated into a new State system partially based on the City's approach?

The relevance of the planning theories of Pluralism and Identity-based politics to this research is examined. What was discovered from the inquiry is reviewed and analysed. The lessons for Adelaide and Australia resulting from this research are identified. Finally, possible Research Questions for further inquiry are suggested.
4.1.2 THE HERITAGE OF THE CITY ARISING FROM LIGHT’S PLAN

The researcher has argued that the heritage of the City arising from Colonel Light’s Plan in 1836, particularly the Park Lands, made Adelaide different from the other capital cities in Australia and this argument will be reviewed in this Section.

The belief that Adelaide is different has continued over time (Grenfell Price, 1924; Pike, 1957; Stretton, 1970; Whitelock, 1977; Freestone, 2010). Peach (1980, p.85) considered Adelaide has civilised qualities which have made the City different and special. Hamnett (1987, p.69) asserted Adelaide is a City with distinctive qualities amongst Australian capital cities. Llewellyn-Smith argued in The Advertiser (‘How Light got it right’, 20 April 1998, p.19) it is the continuous belt of Park Lands which makes Adelaide unique and it is one of the few cities in the world whose boundaries have not been changed since foundation. Mann (1986, p.194) argued it is the heritage of Light’s Park Lands which gives the City its distinctive character as a city in a garden. The Park Lands provide a clear boundary and sense of identity; whether walking, cycling or driving you have go through them to get to the City. This compares to all the other capital cities in Australia where there is no physical evidence separating the centre from the surrounding other local government areas. A good example of this is to compare Figure 1 (the map of Adelaide, p.17) with Figure 3 (p.79) which shows the boundaries of the City of Sydney in 1971.

Peter Smith, the current CEO of the Adelaide City Council, writes in The Weekend Australian (27-28 March 2010, p.6) there is something wonderfully unique about Adelaide which differentiates it from eastern State cities and that is the natural advantage of Light’s plan and design for the City.

As quoted earlier, Peter Garrett states “I had the privilege of adding the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout to the National Heritage List and these are one of Australia’s greatest examples of planning heritage” (Freestone 2010, Foreword, p.vii).

4.1.3 THE INFLUENCE OF KEY INDIVIDUALS

In this Section the researcher reviews the argument that through the influence of key individuals there was a particular relationship between the City and State in terms of their respective power.

263 Federal Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts.
The researcher’s favourite quotation from Shakespeare opened the Introduction in Chapter 1.1 – “What is the City but the people?” Argued throughout Chapters 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 is that key people influenced the City/State relationship which commenced with Light and Hindmarsh in 1836. Over time Reade, Playford and Hart were influential in the State while Worsnop, Veale and Bubb were individuals of influence in the City until 1971.

In Chapter 3.1 it has been argued that Stretton was an individual of considerable influence through the publication of his book “Ideas for Australian Cities” in 1970 and his personal contact with the reformist Premier Dunstan and the reformist Lord Mayor Hayes. Their relationship and respective leadership of the State and Council enabled special legislation to be passed which established a joint State government/local government body, the City of Adelaide Development Committee (CADC).

The CADC was made up of key individuals from the State and the Council who were collectively and individually influential in the City/State relationship. As well as being an author and academic Stretton was Deputy Chair of the South Australian Housing Trust and an activist in North Adelaide. Bakewell was the powerful head of Dunstan’s Premier’s Department. Platten was the chief architect and planner of the Housing Trust. Besides Lord Mayor Hayes, Councillors Bowen, Roche and Chappel were the dominant members of the Council with experience and expertise in real estate, development and architecture. Interim development control though the CADC was seen as a holding operation until a Planning Study of the City could be carried out. George Clarke and Urban Systems Corporation were engaged for the Study primarily because they had produced the City of Sydney Strategic Plan (SCC, 1971). Clarke was an individual of considerable influence and he authored the important and innovative City of Adelaide Planning Study (USC, 1974). Arising from the Planning Study separate legislation was proposed by Clarke, with Stretton’s encouragement, to authorise a new Plan for the City. This had considerable implications for the State Government, particularly in terms of transport policy and the costs of implementation and was therefore unacceptable to the State. Planning Minister Hudson and Lord Mayor Roche politically, and Mant and the researcher administratively, were influential as individuals in the negotiations between the State and the City to convert the Planning Study into the City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81 (CCoA) and the introduction of the innovative City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976.

As examined in Chapters 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 during the period of operation of this Act, from March 1977 until December 1993, Lord Mayors Roche, Joseph, Bowen, Watson, Chapman, Jarvis, Condous and Ninio, but to varying degrees as described, were individuals of influence through their role as
Chairman of the joint City of Adelaide Planning Commission (CAPC) and through their personal meetings with the Premier of the day. Liberal State Premier Tonkin and Planning Minister Wotton from 1979 until 1982 maintained the City’s separate status while a new Planning Act, 1982 was introduced for the rest of the State. Labor State Premier Bannon and his Planning Ministers Hopgood and then Lenehan continued and supported the separate governance arrangements for the City. But as also described in Chapter 3.4 Labor Premier Arnold and his Planning Minister Crafter introduced legislation in 1993 which repealed the City’s own Act and thus ended Adelaide’s separate status.

Mant and McPhail and the Secretaries of the CAPC were State officials who exerted a considerable amount of individual influence on the nature of the City/State relationship through the Planning Commission. Lennon was an influential Director of the State Planning Review and then head of Crafter’s Department. Within the Council the Deputy Lord Mayors responsible for the two major Plan reviews, Manos and Hamilton respectively, and the City Planners Bechervaise and Hodgson, were individuals of influence on the planning of the City during the period from 1984 until 1993.

4.1.4 GOVERNANCE OF THE CITY

The researcher has argued that the governance of the City of Adelaide from 1972 until 1993 was innovative and different to the other capital cities of Australia. This argument is reviewed in this Section.

In the 1960s the policies of the Council and the statutory provisions of the State’s Metropolitan Development Plan, which zoned of the whole of South Adelaide as commercial, contributed to a considerable loss of residential population from the City. In the early 1970s the Council had problems with the State’s statutory scheme and metropolitan transportation proposals. In contrast the State had concerns about the Council’s traffic, parking and development policies. Dunstan and Hayes agreed a new direction was needed for the City. The City used its influence in the Legislative Council to pass separate legislation and, as described in the last Section, the CADC was established. It has been argued that the CADC as a joint body exercised an innovative form of Interim Development Control over the City which was different from any other form of governance then in existence in an Australian capital city in the early 1970s where the respective State Governments maintained power over the cities through statutory planning schemes.
After further agreement between the City and the State another innovative and different legislative approach to city planning was introduced in 1977. Critical political decisions were made which re-established an inner-city residential population but also maintained the City’s role and function as the centre of the metropolitan area. The *City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976* provided a benchmark for governance in Australia as the City had its own legislation and there was a continuation of a joint City/State authority, the City of Adelaide Planning Commission (CAPC).

It has also been argued that this governance model in Adelaide was successful because of a *joint* approach to the development of the City by two levels of government and through the influence of key individuals in the State and the City. There was a political commitment from the Lord Mayors and Premiers as the respective leaders, to this process of planning and development control with a cycle of five-yearly City Plans. This was particularly so in 1985 when a high level political Steering Committee, in addition to the CAPC, was established to review the existing City Plan and adopt a new one for the next five years, 1986-91.

### 4.1.5 THE INTEGRATION OF STRATEGIC AND STATUTORY PLANNING

In this Section the researcher addresses the *integration of strategic and statutory approaches to city planning*. It has been argued that this was inherent in the approach of the CADC to Interim Development Control during the period October 1972 until February 1977 as published in the *First Statement of Policy* (CADC, 1972) and the *Second Statement of Policy* (CADC, 1975). Clarke learnt the lesson from his work in Sydney of the importance of integrating strategic and statutory planning as evidenced in his *City of Adelaide Planning Study* (USC, 1974). He proposed a strategic approach with Objectives and Policies and a statutory approach to provide legal controls over development through a separate *Act* for the City.

After negotiations between the City and State to convert the *Planning Study* into a City Plan the political decision was made to separate the policy parts of the proposed City Plan from the statutory parts (for which legislation was needed). This was an innovative and different approach to planning and development control in Australia in the 1970s but the decision to integrate the mutually interdependent strategic and statutory elements approaches into one document, the *City of Adelaide Plan 1976-81*, was equally important. This approach continued for the next five-yearly City Plans 1981-86; 1986-91, and 1991-96.
4.1.6 THEORIES OF PLURALISM AND IDENTITY-BASED POLITICS

In this Section the researcher reviews the theoretical context of this thesis which is based on the works of Rabinovitz (1973), Self (1982), Badcock (2002) and Allmendinger (2009). The theories of Pluralism and Identity-based politics for planning decisions were chosen as the framework to examine and analyse planning in the City of Adelaide from 1836, but specifically for the period 1972 until 1993, and to ground this analysis in the multitude of political relationships between City and State and the various ways in which they were expressed.

Faludi (1973, pp.22-29) argues that a conceptual framework may be used to develop ideas and how planning ought to proceed. Theory is a form of human thought involved in answering questions as to why particular events occur. Good theories are guides to successful action, no matter whether they represent the world accurately or not, but the more they do this, the better they guide action. Planning is a rational process of thought and action which ultimately aims at promoting human growth and this is the value against which planning should be measured.

As cities become larger and more sophisticated policy-making evolves from an elitist model to a more pluralist model as interests diversify (Allmendinger 2009, p.160). Allmendinger sees Pluralism as a polity of many competing interest groups with overlapping memberships and widely diffused power. However, he contends there is a distinction between Pluralism as analysis and Pluralism as the normative position. But both exist within the context of space and time (ibid, p.163).

Krueckeberg & Silvers (1974, p.7) assert planning is done in a city, at any given point in time, by many groups and organizations, both public and private, individuals and government. Thus Pluralism is the norm. But Versteeg & Hajer (2010, p.165) assert there is bias in Pluralism as in the planning process white, educated, middle class groups tend to be overrepresented in citizen participation. Political participation is easier for those who belong to groups that emphasise civic identity and who are well aware of the modes of conduct, accepted ways of argument and the particular logics of appropriateness in a political discussion.

Communicative planning is defined by Sager (2010, pp.187-88) as an open and participatory enterprise involving a broad range of affected groups in socially orientated and fairness-seeking developments of land, infrastructure or public services guided by a consensus building process designed to approach the principle of discourse ethics. He argues that technical expertise features
less prominently in this form of planning than in other forms. According to Versteeg & Hajer communicative planning theory has added valuable insights to our understanding of how power can be exercised in the planning process (Versteeg & Hajer 2010, p.178). They assert there are three levels of power relations. At the micro level there are specific episodes and interpersonal relationships and actions. At the meso level there are institutional practices and the selection of stakeholders determines the way in which issues are framed. At the macro level the governance culture and embedded cultural values control the discourse and practices (ibid, p.171).

Quade (1975, p.181) argues that in the analysis of planning policy there are always aspects for which quantitative techniques are inadequate or not applicable. Quantitative analysis is of little relevance to politicians who make decisions on the basis of the likely political outcome even though they may have some regard to expert opinion in the advice they receive. Value judgements are an integral part of policy analysis and the analyst must make these explicit so that the politician can consider the planning advice in the light of this relevant information (ibid, p.183). Davidoff (1965), quoted in Allmendinger (2009, p.153), argues that there is no such thing as value-neutrality thus planners should be open about the values that led them to make a particular recommendation to a politician.

The role of the professional planner within the political system is an important aspect of Identity-based politics. While Sager (2010, p.184) sees the role of the planner as more of a facilitator and mediator than as a technical expert, he agrees that in the role of technical expert and advisor to a politician the planner is not value-neutral (ibid, p.193). There is a conflict between the planner’s role of intermediary between the multiplicity of society and the economism of neo-liberal public administration; and bringing the outcome of deliberative democracy to planning documents and recommendations to politicians (ibid, p.208).

Versteeg & Hajer (2010, pp.168-74) argue planners are trained to act as defenders of ‘the public interest’ but this is hard to define. It is impossible to identify one public within the planning process and hence a single public interest. There are a range of ideas and ideals that have to be balanced against each other and any judgement is inherently political. They contend that “when studying politics in planning we cannot know this is how it is, or how it is here if we only study how it is here.”

Krueckeberg (1979, p.309) states that an analytical model is a tool a planner can use for such things as survey results, statistical data analysis, population, employment, land use and transportation systems. A planner with technical skills is able to give expert advice to political decision-makers.
This is important in terms of changes to land use and population, comprehensive land use and transportation studies, and urban development models (ibid, p.318). Krueckeberg (1979, p.324) also contends a planning information system can be used to give a projection of what might happen in terms of transportation and land use. But an urban development model is just that – a forecast of urban development.

Allmendinger (2009, p.148) states there is a contrast between planners as being highly political and as apolitical, technical bureaucrats. As experts they can use information selectively while in positions of power (ibid, p.150). He argues planners have to have a touch of arrogance and be confident to know that they are right even when they are wrong and it is a myth that planners advise and politicians decide (ibid, p.151). In reality planning is essentially a political activity rife with value judgements (ibid, p.171). On the other hand the Code of Professional Conduct of the Royal Town Planning Institute (1994, p.1) states that planners shall act fearlessly and impartially exercise their independent judgement to the best of their skill and understanding. However, this puts planners in a difficult position if a professional recommendation is overturned by a political decision, and then the planner is required to support this political position in an appeal situation against the decision.

Pluralism (Rabinovitz 1973; Self 1982; Badcock 2002; Allmendinger 2009) was described as planning decisions being made taking into account the politics of each issue after weighing up the various interests involved and that urban policy was made by the resolution of conflict amongst divergent interests rather than by intellectual and deliberative choice. The researcher argued throughout Part Three of the thesis that the politicians of the State and the City made decisions on an issue by issue basis taking into account the advice of the expert planners within the prevailing political circumstances of the time. As described in Section 4.1.4 above the State had concerns about the Council’s traffic, parking and development policies; and the Council was worried about the State’s transportation policies and the zoning of the whole of South Adelaide as commercial. Both the ACC and the State had a major concern about the loss of residents from the City and jointly decided to take action to address this issue in 1972. The heritage of the City, Urban Design and Townscape became political issues within the framework of City/State relations.

Identity-based politics came to the fore in Western democracies in the late 1960s and early 1970s and identities emerged as a defence against disorder and the rate of change. The researcher has argued that this theory can be extended to this study because of the influence of individuals involved, starting with Light and Hindmarsh, through Playford and Hart in the State, and Veale and Bubb in the City,
until the influence of Stretton emerged through the reformist Premier Dunstan and the reformist Lord Mayor Hayes in 1971. The influence of individual identities in the City and the State has been summarised in Section 4.1.3 above and is a theme throughout Chapters 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 and the whole of Part Three of this thesis.

It is concluded the application of the planning theories of Pluralism and Identity-based politics were appropriate and relevant to this inquiry. What was also discovered in the research will be examined in the next Section.

4.1.7 WHAT WAS DISCOVERED; THE SUCCESS OF THE ADELAIDE MODEL

What was discovered from this inquiry is reviewed in this Section. The two over-arching Research Questions were:

- In general, why was the City of Adelaide able to have an innovative and different approach to city planning and development control from 1972 until 1993?

- In particular, what were the important factors in the introduction of Interim Development Control for the City in October 1972; in the operation of the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 from March 1977; and in the repeal of this legislation in December 1993 when Adelaide was integrated into a new State system partially based on the City’s approach?

The City of Adelaide was able to have an innovative and different approach to city planning and development control from 1972 until 1993 because there was a particular political relationship between the City and the State from the early days of the founding of the Province and City. South Australia was different from the other States because it was free-settled. Adelaide was different from the other capital cities because of its dominance of the metropolitan area and because of the influence of the establishment through common memberships of the Adelaide City Council, The Adelaide Club, and the Legislative Council of the Parliament. Thus the City was different because it was able to be excluded from certain legislation applying to the rest of the State, or had specific clauses in other legislation which only applied to the City.

These were important factors in 1972 because this difference enabled special legislation to be introduced just for the City in the form of a specific amendment to the Planning Act, 1962. This was followed by the innovative City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 which came into effect in March 1977 as previously described.
The commitment by the Council and the Government to a five-yearly planning process meant there would be certainty for residents, business and developers for three years, with a review in years four and five leading to a new City Plan. The Council and the State recognised the implementation of the City Plan would not be achieved through the ‘negative’ process of statutory development controls alone. Thus there was also a ‘positive’ process of Action Projects within each planning cycle. Both processes were inputs into the review and analysis of what had been achieved. Consequential amendments to the statutory Principles of Development Control arose from the strategic Objectives and Policies of the new City Plan through the innovative governance arrangements of the joint ACC/State City of Adelaide Planning Commission (CAPC) as the successor to the CADC. The other roles of the CAPC were to concur with decisions on applications the Council considered to have merit but were outside the provisions of the City Plan; to assess applications submitted by the Council itself; and to review and provide advice on proposals in the City by the State and Commonwealth Governments. It is concluded Adelaide was different from the other the Australian capital cities as it had its own planning and development control legislation.

The important Objective of increasing the residential population of the City was addressed in various ways. The Council demonstrated residential development was financially viable in South Adelaide by designing, building and selling town houses itself. Young-Anglim (1975) and Badcock & Clother (1978) emphasised the need for incentives for City-living and for a variety of developments to ensure a socio-economic residential mix in the City. The South Australian Housing Trust, which had previously not been involved in the City, through the influence of Stretton (as Deputy Chairman of the Trust) bought run-down residences and rehabilitated them. The Council sold large sites (which had been bought for new roads and road widening) to the Trust in return for high quality design of the new public housing development. The Council offered rate concessions to owner-occupiers to encourage private development. This combination of approaches was successful over time and the City population has increased.

The Planning Study and four five-yearly City Plans for Adelaide were published in a common format with consistent contents. It is asserted that they provided a sequence of documents, all popularly known by the colour of their respective covers, which were unique amongst the capital cities in the history of Australian planning.

264 The residential population of the City in 1972 was 11,896. The long term aim was to increase it to 30,000 and by 30 June 2009 it was 19,444 (Source: Adelaide City Council).
However, in December 1993 after a State Planning Review the separate legislation was repealed and Adelaide was integrated into a new State system, partially based on the City’s approach. It is concluded that the City of Adelaide had a unique system of planning and development control for a period of twenty-one years, from 1972 until 1993, and lessons were learnt for Adelaide and Australia.

4.1.8 LESONS LEARNED FOR ADELAIDE AND AUSTRALIA

In this Section the lessons learned from this inquiry are examined. As described in Section 4.1.5 there are two distinct components to city planning; strategic and statutory approaches. These two components need to be integrated into one document which is then ‘the plan’ for the relevant local government area. This plan will not be implemented by the ‘negative’ process of the application of the statutory controls alone; ‘positive’ actions are also required to achieve the set Objectives.

There needs to be a period of stability and certainty when the planning “rules” remain unchanged so that decisions about development can be made with confidence by all sections of the community. However, there has to be a commitment by planning authorities to a process of review and analysis to take into account changed circumstances and thus provide for a further period of certainty. In Adelaide the joint approach by the State government and Local government to the planning and development of the City was successful with the Planning Study and the four five-yearly City Plans. There was a political commitment from the ACC and the State to this process. Key individuals were appointed to the joint body, initially the CADC and then the CAPC, who could exercise considerable influence. However, when these factors changed, as examined in Chapter 3.4, the importance and role of the joint Planning Commission began to decline and the State’s support for a separate system for the City waned.

States have a legitimate interest in the role and function of their respective capital cities. They retain the right to determine the form of governance that will apply and how the city will be part of the State strategy for the metropolitan area. The State recognised from the Adelaide experience the importance of separating strategic/policy planning from statutory planning and the Development Act, 1993 established two new State bodies. These were a policy body - the Development Policy Advisory Committee (DPAC); and a statutory body - the Development Assessment Commission (DAC). But the integration of strategic and statutory planning approaches was also recognised and the relevant
Development Plan for each local government area in the State contains a combination of these approaches.

Australia is facing an increase in population growth and it is considered this will be primarily hosted in the capital cities and their respective metropolitan areas. This will have implications for infrastructure, public and private transport, land uses, built form and open space. The nature of the systems needed to plan and manage this growth and change will require many elements. The innovative system of planning and development control system which operated successfully in Adelaide for 21 years consisted of many elements which may be summarised as:

- a recognition that planning is primarily a political process
- planning is also a continuous process with cycles of information, investigation, decision, action and review leading to a new cycle
- key individuals need to be in leadership roles that can exert influence
- cities are complex urban systems which need to be managed in a systematic way
- strategic and statutory approaches to planning need to be integrated
- the community has to be involved in setting the Objectives for the local area
  local plans are implemented by the parallel processes of positive actions and statutory controls over development
- the State has to balance local desires with the needs of the broader metropolitan context
- the assessment of development applications should be professional, objective and technical, not political.

It is concluded that Adelaide’s system of planning and development control which operated successfully during the period covered by Part Three of this thesis (October 1972 until December 1993) provides a lesson which could be applicable to the systems needed throughout Australia, particularly the capital cities, to plan and manage growth and change. In the next Section possible further Research Questions resulting from this inquiry are suggested.

4.1.9 FUTURE RESEARCH QUESTIONS ARISING FROM THIS INQUIRY

In this Section future Research Questions arising from this inquiry are suggested which could be pursued. They relate to the ongoing governance and heritage of the City after the separate planning system ceased to exist in December 1993.
Four possible Research Questions are:

“What were the implications for the heritage of the City, particularly the Park Lands and the built form, when the Principles of Development Control became the Development Plan for the City under the transitional provisions of the Development Act, 1993?”

“When the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976 was repealed in December 1993 by the Labor State Government what where the implications for the governance of the City when the new Liberal State Government was of the opinion the Adelaide City Council was just one of all the local government bodies in South Australia and there was no special City/State relationship?”

“What role and function was the City of Adelaide expected to play in the State’s metropolitan strategy of ‘20/20 Vision’ in 1993 and in subsequent policy plans of the State?”

“What City/State traditions of co-operation, process and planning, inherent in the innovations pioneered by the City during the period 1972 until 1993, continue today?

Another line of inquiry might be to investigate the success or otherwise of the integration of strategic and statutory planning at the State level after the Development Act, 1993 came into force. This Act established two separate bodies; a policy body - the Development Policy Advisory Committee and a statutory body - the Development Assessment Commission. The roles of these bodies and how they operate could be examined, particularly in terms of the City within the context of the metropolitan area. A further investigation could evaluate the changes that have occurred to the State and Local Heritage Lists since 1993 and if there have been any losses.

Finally, it is suggested the range of systems available for the assessment of development proposals could be researched. The application of statutory controls is an important part of the planning process. The researcher has long argued the assessment of development applications should be a professional, technical and objective process and not a political one. When elected Councillors at the local level assess applications, too often the result is a political decision made on grounds other than whether the application complies with the statutory controls (Llewellyn-Smith, 1982, 2003). In the Development Act, 1993 a provision was inserted which allowed Councils to appoint Development Assessment Panels with some independent members as well as elected Councillors. It is considered this was a move in the right direction by the State, but further research on this topic is warranted.
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Summary

Seven firms were recommended for interview by the staff – three from Sydney, two from Melbourne and two from Adelaide. Eventually USC with George Clarke (Sydney) was selected to carry out the Planning Study of the City of Adelaide.
APPENDIX 2
KEY PEOPLE OF INFLUENCE IDENTIFIED AS POTENTIAL INTERVIEWEES (65)

GROUP A - "Elder Statesmen"

1. H (Hugh) Stretton  Member CADC; Deputy Chair SAHT; Academic; Resident of North Adelaide
2. JS (John) Chappel  Councillor; Alderman; Deputy Lord Mayor; Member CADC; Member CAPC
3. JVS (Jim) Bowen  Councillor; Alderman; Lord Mayor; Member CADC; Chairman CAPC
4. JJ (John) Roche  Councillor; Lord Mayor; Chairman CADC; Chairman CAPC (DECEASED 2010)
5. SB (Stuart) Hart  Director of Planning; Member CAPC
6. J (John) Brine  Deputy Member CADC; Academic
7. DJ (John) Williams  Secretary CADC
8. GC (Gilbert) Currie  Deputy City Planner and subsequently City Planner ACC
9. RW (Bob) Clampett  Lord Mayor; Chairman CADC (DECEASED 2010)
10. NJ (Newell) Platten  Chief Architect and Planner SAHT; Member CADC; Member CAPC
11. RD (Bob) Bakewell  Director Department of the Premier; Member CADC

11 interviews conducted of the 11 potential interviewees identified

GROUP B - Interviewees based in Sydney

- GC (George) Clarke  Director USC; City of Sydney Strategic Plan; City of Adelaide Planning Study
  DECEASED
12. K (Kyrstyna) Luczak  Department of City Planning Adelaide; widow of George Clarke
13. N (Nicholas) Shehadie  Lord Mayor of Sydney, Member Woolloomooloo Committee
- A (Andrew) Briger  Civic Reform Alderman, Sydney City Council  DECEASED
- L (Leo) Port  Civic Reform Alderman, Sydney City Council  DECEASED
14. W (Bill) Manos  Deputy Lord Mayor of Adelaide; Member CAPC; Chair 1986-91 City of Adelaide
  Plan Committee
15. JH (John) Mant  Advisor to Minister Hudson; Director Urban Development; Member CAPC
16. D (Darrel) Conybeare  Senior Planner USC Sydney and Adelaide Strategic Plans

5 interviews conducted of the 8 potential interviewees identified
GROUP C - City of Adelaide Planning Study Team and Advisors

17. P (Peter) Hignett  Urban Systems Corporation Planning Team
18. G (Gavin) Lloyd-Jones  Urban Systems Corporation Planning Team
19. GW (Geoff) Wagner  Principal Planner, Department of City Planning
20. SG (Stephen) Hains  Urban Systems Corporation Planning Team
   - G (Gwyn) Jarrott  Urban Systems Corporation Planning Team, Secretary CAPC
     UNABLE TO TRACE
   - DA (David) Horner  Urban Systems Corporation Planning Team; Department of City Planning
     DECEASED
21. S (Sybella) Blencowe  Advisor to Bakewell and CADC
   (née Daunt)
22. M (Michael) Bowering  Legal advisor to CADC

6 interviews conducted of the 8 potential interviewees identified

GROUP D - Former Premiers and Ministers responsible for the administration of planning in South Australia 1972-1993

- DA (Don) Dunstan  Labor Premier 1972-1979  DECEASED
- D (Des) Corcoran  Labor Premier 1979  DECEASED
- DB (David) Tonkin  Liberal Premier 1979-1982  DECEASED
- G (Glen) Broomhill  Labor Minister for Planning 1972-1975  DECEASED
- H (Hugh) Hudson  Labor Minister for Planning 1975-1977  DECEASED
- RG (Ron) Payne  Labor Minister for Planning 1977-1979  DECEASED
26. DG (Don) Hopgood  Labor Minister for Planning 1982-1987
27. S (Susan) Lenehan  Labor Minister for Planning 1987-1992

6 interviews conducted of the 12 potential interviewees identified
GROUP E - Lord Mayors and Chairmen of the CADC/CAPC and City Planners of Adelaide 1972-1993

- WH (Bill) Hayes
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CADC 1971-1973
  DECEASED

n/a RW (Bob) Clampett
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CADC 1973-1975
  (Reference Interview 9)
  DECEASED August 2010

n/a JJ (John) Roche
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CADC 1975-77; Chairman CAPC 1977
  (Reference Interview 4)
  DECEASED April 2010

- G (George) Joseph
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CAPC 1977-1979
  DECEASED

n/a JVS (Jim) Bowen
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CAPC 1979-1981
  (Reference Interview 3)

- AJ (John) Watson
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CAPC 1981-1983
  DECEASED

29. WJ (Wendy) Chapman
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CAPC 1983-1985

- JB (Jim) Jarvis
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CAPC 1985-1987
  DECEASED

30. SG (Steve) Condous
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CAPC 1987-1993

- H (Henry) Ninio
  Lord Mayor; Chairman CAPC from May 1993
  UNAVAILABLE FOR INTERVIEW (medical reasons)

- MJ (Michael) Llewellyn-Smith
  City Planner 1974-1981
  (Researcher)

n/a GC (Gilbert) Currie
  City Planner 1982-1984
  (Reference Interview 8)

31. HS (Harry) Bechervaise
  City Planner 1984-1987

32. JD (John) Hodgson
  City Planner 1987-1994

8 interviews conducted of the 14 potential interviewees identified

GROUP F - Chief Executives of the State planning agency, Senior Planners, and Secretaries of the CAPC 1972-93

- G (Grant) Inglis
  Director Environment & Planning 1972-1976
  DECEASED

n/a JH (John) Mant
  Director Urban Development; 1976-1979
  (Reference Interview 15)

33. EJ (Ted) Phipps
  Director Environment & Planning 1979-1984

34. I (Ian) McPhail
  Director Environment & Planning 1984-1992

35. M (Michael) Lennon

36. P (Phil) Smith
  Director (Assessment) Environment & Planning

37. R (Bob) Teague
  Director (Legal) Environment & Planning

- G (Gwyn) Jarrott
  Secretary CAPC 1977-1979
  UNABLE TO TRACE

38. A (Alan) Faunt
  Secretary CAPC 1979-1981

n/a G (Gavin) Lloyd-Jones
  Secretary CAPC 1981-1984
  (Reference Interview 18)

39. B (Bryan) Moulds
  Secretary CAPC 1984-1989

40. H (Helen) Davis (née Hele)
  Secretary CAPC 1989-1993

10 interviews conducted of the 12 potential interviewees identified
GROUP G - Deputy Lord Mayors responsible for City Plan reviews, selected CAPC Commissioners, Members of the State Review

n/a W (Bill) Manos Deputy Lord Mayor; Chair 1986-91 City of Adelaide Plan Committee (Reference Interview 14)

41. M (Mark) Hamilton Deputy Lord Mayor; Chair 1991-96 City of Adelaide Plan Committee

42. J (Judith) Brine State Member CAPC

43. D (Derek) Scrafton State Member CAPC

44. R (Rod) Payze State Member CAPC

45. J (Jane) Rann (née Jose) Council Member CAPC

46. BL (Brian) Hayes Chair State Planning Review 1991-1993

- G (Graeme) Bethune Member State Planning Review 1991-1993

47. S (Steve) Hamnett Member State Planning Review 1991-1993

8 interviews conducted of the 9 potential interviewees identified

SUMMARY

Of the total of 65 potential interviewees identified for the period 1972-1993:

- 14 were deceased
- one was unable to be traced (Jarrott)
- one was unavailable for interview for medical reasons (Ninio)
- one declined to be interviewed (Bethune)
- and one was the researcher (Llewellyn-Smith)

leaving 47 who were interviewed as indicated.
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APPENDIX 5
CONSENT FORM SIGNED BY ALL INTERVIEWEES

THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE HUMAN RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE

STANDARD CONSENT FORM
FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE PARTICIPANTS IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

1. I, ................................................................. (please print name)
   consent to take part in the research project entitled: “Strategic Planning in the City of Adelaide 1969 – 1994: 25 years of difference, innovation and influence”

2. I acknowledge that I have read the attached Information Sheet entitled: “Strategic Planning in the City of Adelaide 1969 – 1994”

3. I have had the project, so far as it affects me, fully explained to my satisfaction by the researcher. My consent is given freely.

4. I have consented to the interview being recorded.

5. I have been informed that the information gained during the study may be published as part of the Ph.D Thesis with appropriate reference or, if given in confidence, the confidentiality will be respected.

6. I understand that I am free to withdraw from the interview at any time.

7. I am aware that I should retain a copy of this Consent Form, when completed, and the attached Information Sheet.

………………………………………………………………………………………………...
(signature)  
(date)

WITNESS

I have described to ................................................................. (name of subject)
the nature of the research to be carried out. In my opinion he understood the explanation.

Status in Project: Researcher - Ph.D Candidate

Name: Michael Llewellyn-Smith

………………………………………………………………………………………………...
(signature)  
(date)
Section 125 of the Australian Constitution, 1900 imposed on the Australian Parliament the duty to establish a national capital within a Commonwealth territory (National Capital Development Commission [NCDC] 1970, p.3). A surveyor from New South Wales, C R Scrivener, was seconded to the Commonwealth to determine the exact site for the new city within the Yass region (Taylor 2006, p.31). Scrivener reported on 25 February 1909 and his recommendation for the Federal (later Australian) Capital Territory was adopted and contained in the Seat of Government Acceptance Act, 1909 (NCDC 1970, p.4).

King O’Malley represented Tasmania in the first federal parliament and as Minister for Home Affairs was responsible for the planning of Canberra. Freestone (1997, p.7), citing Commonwealth Parliamentary Debates, 8 October 1903, states O’Malley dreamt of Canberra as a city that would “rival the London in population, Paris in beauty, Athens in culture and Chicago in enterprise”. O’Malley drove the first peg to start the development of the city on 20 February 1913.

The various concepts of an ideal city in relation to Canberra were summarised by the architect John Sulman who was a leading proponent of town planning in Australia. He was critical of rectangular planning and advocated an alternative approach of radial-concentric lines which he considered would provide ease of movement and possibilities for beautification in terms of public buildings and parklands (Freestone 1997, p.25).

Taylor (2006, p.44) contends that when the international competition for the design of Canberra was announced in 1911, “the utopian ideal of new cities and redevelopment of selected parts of existing cities as a way to social reform, with landscape open space as a critical component, was energetically bubbling away in Australia”. Walter Burley Griffin, a Chicago architect, with Marion Mahoney, was awarded first prize and his original plan, and subsequent changes and developments, are well documented, particularly the influences of the city beautiful and garden city movements (Birrell, 1964; NCDC 1970; Freestone 1986, 1989,1997, 2010; Harrison 1995; Overall 1995; Reid 2002; Taylor 2006).

Freestone considers the competition and Griffin’s winning scheme were the highpoint of the city beautiful dream as Griffin’s design of Canberra was steadily eroded during the seven years Griffin was in charge of its design and construction. In 1920 Sulman was appointed as the chairman of the Federal Capital Advisory Committee and the ‘monumental’ city was put on hold. Planning for Canberra became concerned with functional efficiency with garden suburbs and ‘provisional’ public buildings (Freestone 1997, pp.30-31).

The Federal Parliament moved from its temporary seat in Melbourne to Canberra in 1927 but its growth was hindered by the Great Depression and then World War II. In the 1950s it began to grow quickly and the
national government established the National Capital Development Commission (NCDC) in 1958 as a statutory authority to “plan, develop and construct Canberra as the national capital” (Overall, 1995; NCDC, 2008). John Overall, previously Chief Architect to the South Australian Housing Trust, was appointed as the first Commissioner of the NCDC in 1958 (Overall 1995, p. 5) and Peter Harrison was appointed as the first NCDC Chief Planner in 1959 (Taylor 2006, p. 107). The NCDC had secured funding from the national government to build Lake Burley Griffin and the Kings and Commonwealth Avenue Bridges and when these were opened in 1964 the northern and southern parts of the city were finally unified by the Lake which was the centrepiece of Griffin’s plan (NCDC 1970, p. 18).

Cheesman asserts Westerman from Adelaide “took Hart’s ideas to Canberra” and assisted Harrison in the preparation of the plan, *The Future Canberra*, 1965 (Cheesman 1986, p. 226). Overall contends that Harrison saw his role as preserving Griffin’s vision and idealism of the garden city movement for Canberra (Overall 1995, p. 44). The plan was really an ‘outline plan’ designed to accommodate a population of about 250,000 by 1980.

In the early 1970s the Australian Capital Territory Government had not yet been created and the planning of Canberra was still solely the responsibility of the NCDC. In *Tomorrow’s Canberra*, 1970 four main options for growth were evaluated and the preferred option was a basic statutory land use configuration in the form of three corridor groupings of towns radiating from the central area, plus the satellite town of Queanbeyan (NCDC 1970, p. 213).

The NCDC (1970, p. 182) adopted the following approach:

“The long term planning of Canberra is not a matter of a single policy. It is open-ended strategy aimed at facilitating growth, change, choice and diversity. It involves the management of a living system, the taking of actions to provide for continuing growth, the introduction of new forms of development, the monitoring of response to the planned environment, the continuing evaluation of needs, and an adequate feedback process.”

This General Plan Concept became known as the “Y-plan” (Figure 40). The city was experiencing substantial growth and there was a revised estimate of a future population of around one million people (N Savery 2008, pers. comm., 3 October).

The “Y-plan” sought to preserve the integrity of the central area while developing an urban form that would accommodate growth and strengthen Canberra’s symbolic role as the national capital (Overall 1995, p. 79; Wright 2001, p. 50; N Savery 2008, pers. comm., 3 October).
It is noted there was no governance issue between two levels of government in the early 1970s but Tomorrow’s Canberra, 1970 was an attempt by the NCDC to integrate strategic and statutory planning for the City of Canberra.
George Clarke had stressed during the preparation of the City of Sydney Strategic Plan the integration of the statutory control of development (the “negative” process) and a strategic action planning programme (the “positive” process) as both approaches were important in the implementation of a plan. Thus the Strategic Planning Branch provided comments on major development applications being assessed by the other branches in the Department of Planning and Building. The Gateway application for Woolloomooloo was of major concern to the planning team preparing the Action Plan as it had soon become obvious that the SPA plan had been prepared without any quantified research or any economic or transportation analysis. It appeared to be a simple urban design exercise for an area of some 90 acres (37.5 ha.) without any regard to the impact on the city outside the Woolloomooloo basin itself. Despite vigorous opposition from the researcher the City Planner (Doran) recommended approval of the scheme because in his view the application complied with the provisions of the State Planning Authority (SPA) plan as included in the statutory City of Sydney Planning Scheme, 1971. The Council then approved the application.265

There was considerable adverse reaction from the public and in the media to the Sydney City Council’s (SCC) approval of the Gateway scheme (Golder 1993, p.108). The defective nature of the SPA plan was then discussed at a critical meeting between Briger, Port, Shehadie and the researcher. Briger and Shehadie were persuaded that an entirely new direction had to be taken for Woolloomooloo along the lines suggested by Clarke in the City of Sydney Strategic Plan, 1971 but Port was not convinced as he felt the SCC had a commitment to the developers who had invested in the area. However, when the Labor opposition Aldermen moved to rescind the Gateway approval at the next Council meeting this was not opposed by the CRA Aldermen; Briger and Shehadie had exerted sufficient influence in the Civic Reform Association (CRA) party room over Port.

Clarke and the researcher influenced the President of RAIA (NSW), Bryce Mortlock, to write to the Lord Mayor in August 1972 in the following terms:266

“If the redevelopment proceeds as planned, there is at best serious doubt whether the transport system and road network serving Woolloomooloo will be able to cope with the demands made on them. The developers for the Gateway project propose a modal split of 82% by rail (a higher proportion than London) and a car parking ratio of over 300 cars per site acre, which is double the number set down by the Police Department as a maximum in built up areas if traffic is to be adequately controlled. For these reasons the Chapter recommends that no office development be permitted and that the area should be developed as envisaged in the Strategic Plan.”

The remaining residents in Woolloomooloo, who until that time had had no say in the process, enlisted the help of the Builders Labourers’ Federation of NSW (BLF) and its secretary Jack Munday. The Woolloomooloo

265 See Minutes of the SCC held on 8 May 1972.
Residents’ Action Group (WRAG) was formed with the local parish priest as its secretary. After success in Kelly’s Bush and The Rocks, the BLF imposed a ‘Green Ban’ in Woolloomooloo.

The City Planner obtained an opinion from the City Solicitor and recommended to the Council that all development applications in Woolloomooloo be deferred until the Action Plan had been completed. This decision caused consternation amongst the developers and with the State but Londish was astute enough to realise that Sydney was beginning to face an over-supply of office space and that the SPA plan on which he had based his investment was unworkable. Londish was keen to find an alternative solution and met with the researcher who advised Londish to seek the support of the Premier (Askin) and Minister for Planning and Environment (Fuller) to change the State’s position.267

Lord Mayor David Griffin wrote to Federal Labor Minister Tom Uren on 16 July 1973 seeking the views of the Commonwealth on the situation in Woolloomooloo, particularly the intentions of the Commonwealth regarding the land it owned.268 Uren replied on 3 August 1973 suggesting a meeting between the Lord Mayor, State Minister and himself to discuss the problems but before this occurred he requested a meeting between officers of the SCC, SPA and his Department of Urban and Regional Development (DURD) to propose, in broad principle, alternative courses of action for consideration by the three politicians.269

To progress this proposal the researcher arranged for the City Planner to write to Robert Lansdown (Secretary of DURD) and Ashton (Chairman of the SPA) on 31 August 1973 and included a draft report prepared by the Action Plan team. Comments were received from the SPA on 29 October 1973 and from DURD on 14 November 1973.270 By this time Shehadie had become Lord Mayor to succeed Griffin and he hosted a meeting at the Town Hall on 20 December 1973 between Uren, John Fuller (State Minister for Planning and Environment) and himself. Two alternative courses of action were proposed in the report for Uren, Fuller and Shehadie to consider. The first was the implementation of the approved (and foreshadowed) development applications and the road pattern arising from the Woolloomooloo Redevelopment Study (however unlikely this was given the Green Ban). The second was a comprehensive review. After much discussion, Uren, Fuller and Shehadie agreed unanimously that a comprehensive review was justified and should commence as soon as possible. Shehadie (Shehadie, Nick, ohi 13/ 55:60, Sydney, 30 November 2007) has a personal perspective on the meeting with Uren and Fuller and what Uren might be expecting from it:

“It was interesting that the three of us were from different political persuasions – Labor, Liberal and Civic Reform. I thought the planning team had done a marvellous job. As the last item on an agenda Uren had a habit of always asking for something else. I had a whisper that Uren wanted a particular plan to look at and the planning team stayed up all night to produce something. When Uren said he would like to see a plan I was able to say “Mr. Minister, here it is” and this established the planning credibility of the Council.”

267 Personal meeting between Londish and the researcher and there are no written records.
268 See SSC Town Clerk’s file 430/1972/26.2.
269 See SCC Town Clerk’s file 430/1972/43.1.
270 See SCC Town Clerk’s file 430/1972/43.22.
Uren then provided the SCC with $20,000 to assist with the costs of preparing the Action Plan and the planning team was responsible to a joint Woolloomooloo Steering Committee representing local, state and national governments.271

The City Planning and Building Department was restructured by the Council under Shehadie’s influence and a new position of Deputy City Planner was created with responsibility to chair the joint Woolloomooloo Steering Committee. The researcher was appointed as Deputy City Planner in January 1974. The other members of the Steering Committee were Henry Wardlaw (DURD), John Waugh (SPA) and Paul Ford (NSW Housing Commission).

In accordance with the SCC’s policy of citizen participation in the planning process, all residents, landowners and other interested parties were invited to participate in the preparation of a detailed plan. The Council rented premises in the area (at 87 Forbes Street) as the first “shop front” planning centre in Australia to facilitate meetings and provide an exhibition space. It was clear the BLF was going to play an important role in terms of supporting the residents and arrangements were made for the researcher to meet informally with Munday away from the Town Hall. The Lord Mayor took personal responsibility within the SCC for Woolloomooloo even though Briger still had political responsibility for the Action Planning programme. Munday was eventually persuaded to meet with Shehadie who recalls his relationship with Munday (Shehadie, Nick, ohi 3/ 45:48, Sydney, 30 November 2007):

“I thought that Jack Munday was very courageous and honest. After some initial meetings between you (the researcher) and Jack I invited him in for a discussion about Woolloomooloo. He used to come into the Lord Mayor’s Room for a coffee every week and we became firm friends.”

Shehadie, Fuller and Uren met again on 8 March 1974 and reviewed the progress that had been made. The design concept that emerged after extensive consultation with residents and landowners was a low rise medium density housing scheme in the Woolloomooloo basin with restoration of existing buildings wherever possible and sensitive new infill residential development. A further meeting was held between Shehadie, Fuller and Uren on 29 April 1974 when they viewed the proposal and agreed it could be placed on public exhibition.272

A public meeting was held on 13 May 1974 at the Forbes Street centre for a presentation by the planning team about proposals for Woolloomooloo which would then be on public exhibition. Munday had heard that there might be some trouble at the meeting because feelings between residents and developers were running high. Munday advised the researcher he was going to provide some members of the BLF at the meeting to ensure the safety of the planning team.

---

271 See SCC Town Clerk’s file 430/1973/19.29.
272 See SCC Town Clerk’s file 430/1973/19.29
A brochure, signed jointly by Shehadie, Fuller and Uren, was distributed extensively with an invitation to attend the exhibition and participate in the planning process. Colin James was appointed by Uren as an advisor to WRAG and he worked closely with the researcher and the planning team. James (in Webber 1988, Chapter 6) describes his involvement in some detail and comments in particular that the ‘Loo (as Woolloomooloo was then affectionately known by the residents) provided the city with a handy workforce living close to the centre which was needed to ensure the provision of services.

Administrative agreement on the way forward was agreed between the City, State and Commonwealth by the end of August 1974. The researcher was therefore able to leave Sydney in September 1974 to take up his new position of City Planner of Adelaide. Work continued to finalise the details of the agreement under the direction of the new Deputy City Planner in Sydney (Brian Wilson). The formal Agreement was signed in June 1975 by Labor Prime Minister Gough Whitlam, Liberal State Premier Tom Lewis and Lord Mayor [Sir] Nicholas Shehadie. The zoning for the area was changed on 8 August 1975 by an Interim Development Order to vary the statutory City of Sydney Planning Scheme, 1971. The State Housing Commission then compulsorily acquired the land with funds provided by the Commonwealth. This ensured Woolloomooloo was re-established in its role as a residential area within the city. However, Golder (2004, p.154) comments that while Woolloomooloo was saved for residential use, the City Council had to deal with claims of disaffected developers who missed out on the profits promised under the SPA statutory plan. Court cases dragged on for years but judgement finally went against the developers in the High Court in 1986 (Ashton 1993, p.108).
APPENDIX 8
DIRECTIONS OF THE COMMISSIONERS TO SURVEYOR-GENERAL LIGHT

The instructions for Colonel Light from the Colonisation Commission established by the South Australia Colonisation Act, 1834 were that he was to examine 1500 miles (2414 kilometres) of coastline, select the best situation for the first settlement, survey the town site, and divide the country into sections. Specifically, the Commissioners advised Light that in his selection for the site for the first settlement he was to combine the following advantages:

1st A commodious harbour, safe and accessible at all times of the year
2nd A considerable tract of fertile land immediately adjoining
3rd An abundant supply of fresh water
4th Facilities for internal communication
5th Facilities for communication with other ports
6th Distance from the limits of the colony, as a means of avoiding interference from without
7th The neighbourhood of extensive sheepwalks
8th A supply of building materials, as timber, stone, or brick, earth and lime
9th Facilities for drainage
10th Coal

In addition the Commissioners instructed Light to:

Look to any new town precedent in America and Canada.273

273 See Letter of Instructions dated 9 March 1836 signed by Rowland Hill (Light, 1839; Gill, 1910.)
APPENDIX 9
COLONEL LIGHT CEREMONY AND STATUE

In 1858 Colonel Light’s old friend George Palmer sent a silver bowl to the Mayor and Corporation of the City of Adelaide on behalf of himself, Jacob Montefiore, Raikes Currie and Alexander Elder who had all been influential figures in the settlement of the Colony (Dutton 1960, p.289; Whitelock 1977, p.37). The bowl has the following inscription:

Presented to the Mayor and Corporation of Adelaide that they may thereout drink in Australian wine to the memory of Lieut. Col. Light, the first Surveyor-General of South Australia.

The Council authorised the expenditure of funds on colonial wine and the annual tradition of a toast to Light began in 1859. When the Adelaide Town Hall was built in 1868 the ‘Colonel William Light Ceremonial’ took place in the Council Chamber and it became the custom for the Mayor (later Lord Mayor) to deliver an address at the first Council meeting after the elections to the Council and invited guests who always included the Governor, Premier and Chief Justice. The various Lord Mayors gave very personal addresses referring to different aspects of Light’s life and work, but always concluded with the words: “I ask you to stand and drink, in silence, a toast to the memory of the founder of the City of Adelaide, Colonel William Light”. In 2006 the Council decided to transfer the location of the annual ceremony to Light Square but the tradition of the toast to Light as part of the ceremony has continued.

The Council commissioned a fine bronze statue of Light which was designed by William Birnie-Rhind and erected in Victoria Square in 1906 (Dutton, 1960, p.298; Whitelock 1977, p.67). It was moved to its present position on Montefiore Hill, North Adelaide in 1938 where his finger points to the City he founded. It is now known as “Light’s Vision”.

---

274 See Minutes of the first meeting of the new Council of the City of Adelaide after each Council election; the researcher was personally involved in these ceremonies as the Town Clerk from 1982 to 1993.
Badcock asserts that the way cities are organised spatially says a great deal about their governance and the economic, political and cultural systems of the societies in which they have evolved. The city is an arena for economic development, political action, social life and environmental stress. A theoretical body of knowledge, together with a systems of values, provides the intellectual framework that largely determines how problems and issues which arise in cities are perceived and how forms of action to respond to these are taken (Badcock 2002, pp.1-3).

City/states first appeared in Mesopotamia around 3200–3000BC. The city/states of Greece, particularly Athens and Sparta, had a commercial role where manufactured goods were traded for agricultural imports. The city was the ‘central place’ and had a sphere of influence over the surrounding area although Athens itself did not occupy a large amount of land (Badcock 2002, pp.20-41).

In Italy, from the seventh century onwards, there were city/states in Milan, Venice, Genoa, Florence and Sienna. City/states emerged in northern Europe in the thirteenth century. The Renaissance in Europe fostered trade links in these city/states. Particular cities favoured by international trade also gained from the centralisation of political control and government functions. The dominant cities evolved as reasonably independent city/states with their own hinterlands, or as a loose knit group of centres seeking mutual advantage from trade or cultural ties (Badcock 2002, pp.42-49).

Toynbee (1979, p.44) believes that city/states were distinctive as they exhibited the trappings of states, but supported a comparatively sophisticated urban culture. He defines a city/state as a state in which one city was so superior in terms of population and power relative to any other cities in the urban hierarchy that it was indisputably paramount.

With the unification of the Italian and German city/states in the middle of the eighteenth century the city/state model gradually disappeared and today city/state governance only survives in the Vatican, Singapore, Monaco and San Marino (Badcock 2002, p.43).

Badcock argues a city is a complex amalgam of past, present and newly forming patterns that co-exist in the urban landscape. Understanding governance holds the key to how a city is created and modified over time (Badcock 2002, p.225).
APPENDIX 11
BRIEF FOR THE PLANNING STUDY

Arland wrote to Harrison and Winston on 7 October 1971 confirming their appointment as advisors to the Council. 275 Harrison produced the first draft of a Discussion Paper entitled “Planning for the City of Adelaide.” He suggested the primary objective of the study would be the preparation of policies for the ACC to promote change and direction with the widest possible community support. It was proposed that the study be undertaken by independent consultants who would draw on the available information from the ACC and State agencies. Harrison commented that there were few modern precedents for the kind of study proposed but he quoted the *City of Sydney Strategic Plan* (SCC, 1971) as a very useful model. However, the study was seen as providing clear guidelines for a Supplementary Development Plan and Regulations as the statutory basis for land use. Harrison saw advantages in an Adelaide-based firm having the central responsibilities as part of a consortium. He suggested the firm of Pak-Poy and Associates (Adelaide) with Llewellyn-Davies, Walter Bor and Associates (London), and the international firm Jones, Lang Wotton (to provide advice on property economics) as an appropriate consortium. Harrison estimated the cost of the study would be $150,000. 276

Winston and Harrison met in Sydney on 27 October and in Canberra on 11 December 1971. When Winston worked on the draft some subtle changes were made, particularly in relation to recommending a particular consortium. Instead, invitations to undertake the work were to be sent to organisations which had the majority of the necessary expertise themselves and would be prepared to staff an office in Adelaide. The *Winston-Harrison Report* dated 30 December 1971 concluded that the success of the undertaking would depend on the personnel involved rather than the detailed direction of their work.

The Report, and a covering report from Arland, was considered by the Council’s senior committee in late January 1972 and on 2 February 1972 the Council decided:

“(i) Consultants be sought to prepare the City of Adelaide Planning Study as a prerequisite to the Supplementary Development Plan (at an estimated cost of $150,000).

(ii) The consultants be selected generally in accordance with the method outlined in the Winston-Harrison Report.

(iii) The Council authorise action to seek registration of interested consultants in accordance with a prepared invitation.

(iv) The method of seeking registration be defined by the Lord Mayor and Chairman of the Building and Town Planning Committee (Councillor Roche).

(v) The necessary details relating to the preparation of the Supplementary Development Plan be defined after discussion with the selected consultants, but before a contract is entered into with the appointed consortium.” 277

275 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/B.
276 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/C
277 See Minutes of the meeting of the ACC 9 February 1972, p.378 (b).
It was also decided an advertisement would be placed in all daily newspapers circulating in Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide on 5, 9 and 12 February 1972 with registrations closing at noon on 6 March. A Select Committee was established by the ACC specifically for the purpose of choosing a consultant and consisted of Lord Mayor Hayes and Councillors Bowen, Roche and Chappel (the four members of the CADC).

A total of 25 submissions were received by the due date and are shown in Appendix 1. All the submissions were reviewed administratively by Bubb, Currie and Wagner. They recommended seven firms for short-listing to the Select Committee of the Council and provided reasons for not recommending the other 18.

---

278 Adelaide City Archives. Box 0516/0001.1972 Accession No. 517
APPENDIX 12
TEXT OF DUNSTAN’S ADDRESS IN REPLY

This matter has been under discussion for some time with members of the Adelaide City Council. The problem facing the Council has been the provisions of the 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan which specified the land use in South Adelaide to be wholly commercial and light industrial. The view of the Government and the Council is that there should be a substantial residential population in the square mile of the City, and of course in North Adelaide. This work should be subject to joint encouragement by the Government and the City Council, it is not something that can be placed on the Council’s shoulders alone. The Government will have to be involved. It is clear that the development of the City of Adelaide needs better control procedures than are available to the Council at present. The reason for wanting to incorporate joint action with the Government is that some provisions of the total planning will be needed from the Government in relation to reduction of financial requirements by government on properties. It will be necessary for the Government to be appraised of the proposals of the consultant planners to the Adelaide City Council, who over the next two years are preparing a Supplementary Development Plan. Government departments will be affected vitally by the proposals and it will be absolutely necessary to incorporate the work of the State Planning Authority and of the various Government Departments concerned with the work of the Council. Therefore it was considered that a joint body be established as the Government is just as much involved in the decisions as the Adelaide City Council. While the Council was earlier given Interim Development Control powers under Section 41, this only operates in relation to the Metropolitan Development Plan. Unless we brought in much tighter Interim Development Control of the kind proposed here, we would not meet the needs of the City in relation to residential restoration or the ability to control height and space relationships that would be vital to satisfactory planning. These proposals were welcomed by the Lord Mayor and Council representatives and we have concluded this is the only sensible way to proceed. The development of the central area has long been advocated by planners. I well recall the late Robin Boyd’s coming to South Australia and saying “Look, at the rate things are going under the present lack of planning in the City of Adelaide you won’t have a city and suburbs because you won’t have any ‘urbs’ to be ‘subbed’.” This measure will provide a planning process which will give real teeth to a responsible authority to ensure we get the kind of City I believe the vast majority of the citizens of this State want to see.279

Clarke was supposed to establish a team with senior planners in terms of the contract. In the USC submission Conybeare was going to have a significant role but he resigned from USC shortly after the Study commenced. Conybeare recalls (Conybeare, Darrel, ohi 16 / 82:85, Sydney, 24 October 2007) being lectured by a taxi driver on a ride from Adelaide airport that Adelaide was a City/State. Adelaide was South Australia. This impressed Conybeare and he considered the focus in the Planning Study should be to concentrate activities in the City. He also reflects on the nature of Adelaide (ibid,16 / 104:109):

“The first meeting of the proposed consultant group was at the Tea House in the Botanic Gardens. Devonshire Tea was served by waitresses in starched white aprons and hats. It was a wonderful moment and reflected the essential style of Adelaide. This was something that could never have happened in Sydney.”

Clarke appointed Hignett as the initial Project Manager. Hignett organized the USC office in Industry House (in Pirie Street opposite the Town Hall) and the office opened on 1 February 1973. Horner was seconded to the team from the ACC and Currie was appointed to act as the liaison officer. Clarke employed a number of recent local graduates to do the work. Given Clarke’s comments at the interview, as quoted, it appears he must have considered them to have been as good as the staff in his other offices. The Planning Team was listed in the City of Adelaide Planning Study (USC 1974, p.85) as:

George Clarke (Project Director)
Peter Casey (Sydney)
Stephen Hains
David Horner (seconded from the Council)
Gwyn Jarrott (Office Manager)
Gavin Lloyd-Jones
Geoffrey Walker
Ian Alexander (Perth)
Peter Hignett (only identified as an advisor although he had been the initial Project Manager)
Gilbert Currie (liaison officer with the Council).

Hains was working in Canberra and wrote to Clarke seeking employment in the Adelaide office. Hains was interviewed by Clarke and employed to look at the property, economic and social issues (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 11:18, Salisbury, 14 November 2007). Lloyd-Jones was involved with architectural work in the City and was employed by Clarke to have a role in urban design (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 18:23, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007). Clarke also brought Gwyn Jarrott to Adelaide from the Sydney office of USC in the role of Office Manager to manage the accounts and personnel matters.
APPENDIX 14
CLARKE AND HIS METHOD OF WORKING

Currie (Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 66:71, Dulwich, 24 April 2007) observes Clarke was uncertain about Currie’s role and thought he might be a ‘spy’ for Arland and Bubb, but this was resolved and they worked well together during the Study. Lloyd-Jones (Lloyd-Jones, Gavin, ohi 18 / 39:42, Urrbrae, 6 November 2007) observes Currie and Horner from the ACC were in a difficult position but they contributed a huge amount of background on a range of issues.

Roche (Roche, John, ohi 4 / 32:35, North Adelaide, 17 April 2007) considered Clarke was a very difficult person to control and he was not putting in the hours he had contracted for. Clarke was not performing but his response was to bring in Professor Martyn Webb from Perth as a specialist advisor.

Bowen (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 99:107, College Park, 16 April 2007) reflects on Clarke’s other work and the involvement of Professor Martyn Webb. Bowen contends part of the problem was Clarke was working in Sydney on the Action Projects arising out of the Strategic Plan there, and was also trying to get a job in Perth. He knew Webb in Perth and used him to try and persuade the CADC that Clarke could really do the job and when Clarke did the work himself and was ‘hands on’ he was terrific.

Clarke’s method and style of working was unusual. He did not have a regular working day and was very easy going with long relaxed lunches. However, when deadlines approached things became frantic and he would often be up until 3am with his red pen rewriting drafts the Team had produced (Currie, Gilbert, ohi 8 / 71:76, Dulwich, 24 April 2007).

Williams (Williams, John, ohi 7 / 90:93, Leabrook, 20 April 2007) also recalls Clarke worked very long hours and as the deadline approached for submission of the Progress Reports which were due every four months. He seemed to have everything in his head and it was remarkable what he could produce under pressure.

When Clarke was in Adelaide before a Progress Report was due he would draw up a work program with all his staff from 8am until 12.30am the next day, starting again at 8am with the printing and binding of the Report to be ready by 6pm that day to give to the Council. Hains (Hains, Stephen, ohi 20 / 47:49, Salisbury, 14 November 2007) observes:

“Clarke was an amazing individual and totally unforgiving. He was extraordinary, unbelievable and magical but he could also be grossly offensive and ruthless. It was not unusual for Clarke to ring me at 2am when he had just thought of something. Clarke was quite unorthodox but a highly political animal.”

280 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 91/72
## APPENDIX 15
### USC PROPOSED ACTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP1</th>
<th>Streetscape Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP2</td>
<td>City Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP3</td>
<td>The Park Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP4</td>
<td>Palmer and Brougham Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP5</td>
<td>Pocket Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP6</td>
<td>Upper Torrens – Zoo Frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP7</td>
<td>Adelaide Rail Yards–Joie de Vivre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP8</td>
<td>Adelaide Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP9</td>
<td>The Railway Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP10</td>
<td>Historic Barracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP11</td>
<td>Street Furniture and Graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP12</td>
<td>Government House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP13</td>
<td>Low-Rent Boarding and Lodging Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP14</td>
<td>Community Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP15</td>
<td>Register of Places of Environmental Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP16</td>
<td>Pollution Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP17</td>
<td>North Adelaide Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP18</td>
<td>Melbourne Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP19</td>
<td>Hindley Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP20</td>
<td>East End Markets/Fruit and Produce Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP21</td>
<td>Central Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP22</td>
<td>Wakefield-Angas Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP23</td>
<td>Frome Street South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP24</td>
<td>Pedestrian Network and Shelter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP25</td>
<td>Public Transport in Hindley and Rundle Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP26</td>
<td>Bikeways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 16
DETAILS OF THE USC DRAFT CITY PLAN

The Activity System in the draft City Plan contained the Economic Base; Leisure and Learning; and Living Objectives. The Environmental System consisted of Objectives for Landscape and Streetscape; Built Form and Conservation; and Environment Protection. The Movement System was made up of Objectives for Pedestrians; Public Transport; Vehicular Traffic, and Parking. The ten Objectives were all framed as imperatives (such as ‘Create’ or ‘Strengthen’). After the Objectives there were six overall Management Policies giving broad descriptions of the Core, Frame, Residential and Park Lands Districts and how they were to be managed. The Economic Base Objective was supported by 17 Policies and three Concept Diagrams relating to the District Structure, the Precinct Structure and Plot Ratios. The Leisure and Learning Objective was supported by 12 Policies (for example promoting the City as the tourist centre for the State, and as the location for the visual and performing arts). Eight Policies (for example encouraging the SAHT to have a program for the City, and developing community centres in the Residential Precincts) were in support of the Living Objective. In the Environmental System the Landscape and Streetscape Objective was supported by 25 Policies and four Concept Diagrams covering Park Lands Planting; Areas in the Park Lands for return to Recreational Use; Street Tree Planting; and areas for ‘High’, ‘Medium’ or ‘Low’ landscaped space. The Built Form Objective was supported by 17 Policies (for example shaping the built form of the City, and preparing detailed plans for areas considered to be of townscape significance) and three Concept Diagrams related to City Squares; ‘High’, ‘Medium’ and ‘Low’ Building Heights; and 281 Places of Environmental Significance. Under the Environmental Protection Objective there were 11 Policies (for example improvements to the River Torrens, and for refuse management) and one Concept Diagram covering areas for ‘High’, ‘Medium’ and ‘Low’ Noise Controls. There was one Concept Diagram and six Policies (for example the diversion of through traffic around the City) related to the Overall City Movement which were not part of any Objective. The Pedestrian Objective in the Movement System was supported by 18 Policies (for example giving priority to pedestrians within the Core District) and one Concept Diagram for a Pedestrian Network. Eleven Policies (for example concentrating activities so that they could be efficiently served by public transport) and one Concept Diagram for a Public Transport Network were in support of the Public Transport Objective. The Vehicular Traffic Objective was supported by a Concept Diagram for a Vehicular Traffic System and by 18 Policies (for example establishing a hierarchy of roads, and narrowing some carriageways). Finally, the Parking Objective was supported by 18 Policies and two Concept Diagrams covering On Site Parking with three zones (including one in the Core where parking would be prohibited), and a Public Parking Station system. Three Precincts were proposed for the Core District; nine Precincts for the Frame District, and nine Precincts for the Residential District. It was intended that all future planning, development and conservation would be in keeping with, or help to control, the Desired Future Character of each Precinct. A Joint City/State body was proposed as it was recognised about 75% of the City was in public ownership which included the Park Lands, roads, and buildings owned by the Commonwealth, State and Local Government and their agencies.
APPENDIX 17
CADC REPORT TO PREMIER DUNSTAN

The CADC considered the ongoing governance of the City was important and supported the concept of a joint Review Committee on the basis there was a need for a body that had ultimate responsibility for planning the City, but this should not be the SPA. Michael Bowering (CSO) was invited to address the question of whether the Crown should be bound by the new legislation. Bowering advised he basically agreed with the proposed Bill, and with appropriate ‘polishing’ it should work well and the Directives would be a useful tool. However, binding the Crown was a political not a legal decision.281

The Council held a weekend seminar on 7 and 8 December about the draft City Plan and legislation and the State members of the CADC were invited to attend.282 Bowering attended the regular meeting on 9 December and provided detailed advice on the use of Regulations compared to the Directives proposed under the new legislation. Under influence from Stretton the CADC considered the appropriate course of action would be to advise Dunstan that it favoured a separate Act for the City with a minimum number of Regulations to implement the Plan.283

Bakewell addressed the Chamber of Commerce at this time and stated that planning for the motor car and planning for a gracious urbane city for people were two quite different things. He advised that the Commonwealth and State Governments had assured the CADC of their cooperation in the City Plan, even though they would not be bound by its decisions. Bakewell argued the case of governance and that the success of the City Plan would be measured on how well the ACC and State worked together because, to make the City a better place, there could not be unplanned and uncontrolled development.284

In January 1975 the CADC reported to Dunstan on the Planning Study in the following terms:

- The Directives should be Regulations.
- The ACC should be the responsible planning authority for day to day planning.
- The Review Committee should be primarily concerned with policies and City/State governance and cooperation.

281 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ninety-first meeting of the CADC 4 November 1974, pp.1013–1014.
282 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ninety-fifth meeting of the CADC 2 December 1974, p.1060.
283 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ninety-sixth meeting of the CADC 9 December 1974, p.1073.
284 Adelaide City Archives. City Planner’s Department File P66A/74.
285 Adelaide City Archives. Minutes of the ninety-sixth meeting of the CADC 9 December 1974, p.1075.
As far as possible any appeals should be restricted to purely legal matters.

All levels of Government should have the responsibility of contributing to the Action Projects to develop the City.

The CADC considered the SPA would not be able to give the central area the special attention it needed. The concept of “management by exception:” was supported as well as the composition of the Crown Committee with the Lord Mayor of the day as Chairman. It was stressed that the three Council nominees need not necessarily be elected members of the Council, and the three Government nominees need not necessarily be public servants. The nomination of women for the Committee was encouraged. While it was noted the Crown would not be bound, it was proposed that any State projects should be discussed at an early stage with the new Review Committee. It was suggested there should be a City of Adelaide Appeals Tribunal made up of members of the existing Planning Appeals Board but restricted to the City, and not a new Local Government Court. Third party appeals were opposed provided the public had adequate opportunity to comment on development applications. Finally, the underlying philosophy of the Plan to make the City a better place was endorsed.286

Bakewell advised the CADC at its meeting on 11 August 1975 that the State had questioned whether a separate Act was needed for the City on the basis that it should be possible to incorporate the required provisions into the Planning and Development Act, 1966–72. The CADC was also advised that the City of Adelaide Plan, as adopted by the ACC, would be on public display for a period of three months commencing on 14 August 1975 and that once representations had been analysed and reported upon, the legislation needed to be in place for the Plan to be authorised. Given the State’s legislative program it was unlikely that new legislation for the City would be in place by 30 June 1976 when the existing interim development controls were due to expire.

Given this advice the CADC requested the Chairman (who by this time was Lord Mayor Roche) to discuss this matter with Premier Dunstan as a matter of urgency.287

---

286 Adelaide City Archives. Accession No.4647, Item1.
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APPENDIX 18
COUNCIL’S PROCESS TO FINALISE THE CITY PLAN

The Council operated on the basis of five technical committees which were called ‘Planning & Building’; ‘Residential Development’; ‘Health, Welfare, Recreation & Park Lands’; ‘Commercial, Industrial & Civic’, and ‘Works, Traffic & Parking’. Each representation on the draft Plan was given a number and contained the Name, Address, Organisation, Property affected, Business, and aspects of the draft Plan in question. Some examples of the representations were the National Trust (no. 199) which requested that all the buildings in the City on the National Trust’s List be included on the Register of Places. A former Lord Mayor, James Irwin (no. 266) objected to his property being included and this was typical of all owners of properties proposed to be listed. The RAA (no. 232) submitted that unless accessibility to the City was of a high standard, the Economic Base Objective could not be achieved. The Tonkin Automotive business near Whitmore Square (no. 272) wanted assurance about a right of expansion, as well as continued use rights. Wagner (Wagner, Geoff, oh! 19 / 85:89, Burnside, 6 November 2007) recalls Tonkin was one of the many people who were angry and difficult to deal with because of the interim CADC policy which protected residential property and was now proposed to become part of the permanent statutory controls. In April 1975 Clarke recommended amendments to the exhibited draft City Plan. He provided detailed comments on all the Policies and suggested deletion of Diagram 10, the proposed Register of Places for conservation, because of the many objections. Bubb had exerted considerable influence on the Works, Traffic & Parking Committee. Bubb was opposed to any reduction in traffic movement and he wanted Concept Diagram 12 (Overall Movement) to show short term proposals; proposals which should be monitored and dependent upon the metropolitan transport system, and long term proposals. Consequently the committee had raised concerns about the proposed road hierarchy and traffic movement. As a result, Clarke revised Concept Diagram 12 and placed an emphasis on support from the Commonwealth and State Governments to achieve the desired outcomes. He amended the Policies in support of the Movement System to clarify those actions which were conditional upon other actions and proposed that roads should only be closed after consultation with those most directly affected. Clarke also suggested that a number of policies in the traffic area should become further investigations rather than commitments to action. However, after discussion with the Commissioner for Highways, Bubb was in favour of the Mann Terrace/Park Terrace one-way pair of roads as had been proposed in the City of Adelaide Planning Study (USC 1974, p.132) on the basis it would be funded by the State and
the Town of Walkerville as well as the Council. The Health, Welfare Recreation & Park Lands Committee only had minor comments on the Policies within its area of responsibility. The administrative Finance & Budgets Committee went through all the Policies and assigned them a value – positive and favourable; negative and unfavourable; or neutral. As a result it was concluded there could be an additional development expenditure of $1.25 million in the first year of the operation of the Plan. Clarke and the City Planner considered all the representations in depth and, having regard to Clarke’s recommendations, redrafted the City Plan to only contain the Objectives, Policies and Desired Future Character Statements. The definition of “Objective” was amended by the addition of the words ‘and to which the assistance and cooperation of the Commonwealth Government is sought.’ All the Policies would only be ‘Guiding’ and the Concept Diagrams were deleted. New diagrams were added only where they were needed to serve as graphic elaborations of the Policies. “Policy” was redefined to be “These are specific courses or methods of action which have been selected to guide decisions relevant to the achievement of the Objectives of the Plan. They are expressed in written form and, where necessary, illustrated in graphic form by diagrams.” There were some minor changes to the wording of the ten Objectives but the titles remained unchanged. The Explanatory Statement, the Bill and the Action Projects were no longer considered as part of the Plan itself (CCoA 1977, p.111). The City Planning Committee on 28 April 1975 considered the Reports of the five technical committees (in one Volume) and the new Plan (in a second Volume) as redrafted by Clarke and the City Planner after taking all relevant matters into account. The committee considered all the original Objectives and Policies recommended by USC, the recommendations of the technical committees on them, and the City Planner’s comments. After considerable discussion, the committee on 26 May 1975 decided that if there was no objection from a technical committee or a Head of Department then the Objective, Policy or Diagram would be adopted. Otherwise it endorsed the original wording, or endorsed the technical committee’s recommendation for change, determined whether each policy should be ‘governing’ or not, which Policies should become an Action Project, and which should be deleted. A Council seminar was held on 8 June 1975 when the outstanding issues about the Objectives, Policies and Diagrams were discussed and resolved.

288 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File No. 262/C/1.
On 18 December 1975 the Council decided there would be a series of hearings which would be open to the public and the press. Of the 287 representations received, 49 representors had requested the opportunity to be heard in person and the Council established a series of Panels based on the Ward system so that representors were primarily heard on a geographic basis by their local representatives. Six Panels of four each consisted of the Lord Mayor, one of the six Aldermen and the two respective Ward Councillors. A seventh Panel, to hear State and Commonwealth Departments and Agencies, consisted of the Lord Mayor and the three Council members of the CADC. The Robe Ward Panel heard representors on the morning of 28 January 1976 and the MacDonnell Ward Panel met that afternoon. The Hindmarsh Ward Panel met on the morning of 29 January 1976 and the Gawler Ward Panel heard representors that afternoon. On 30 January 1976 the Grey Ward Panel heard representors in the morning and the Young Ward Panel in the afternoon. The General Panel met in the evening on 11 February 1976 to hear the various State and Commonwealth Departments and Agencies.

As a result of these hearings and the submissions made in support of the written representations, the City Planner prepared a “Supplementary Report” for a special meeting of the City Planning Committee on 19 March 1976 which recommended further changes to the City Plan. These included adding the word “Culture” to Objective V; completely rewriting the Policy about making Victoria Square and King William Street pedestrian dominant areas so that this would be dependent on the north-south bypass and the rapid transport system being completed; changing the Rundle Street Precinct to the Rundle Mall Precinct; and in relation to Action Projects ensuring that affected and interested parties would participate in their preparation.

When the report of the City Planning Committee was considered by the Council on 27 March 1976, a further seven minor amendments were made, including one to give priority to the proposed parking station behind Government House, and then the City Plan was adopted.

---

289 Adelaide City Archives, Accession No.125, Boxes 1-5.
290 See Minutes of the meeting of the ACC held on 27 March 1976, p.926.
APPENDIX 20
SUBMISSIONS BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The Department of Transport emphasised the need for the Western Bypass, it supported the tram extension north and a compact core which could be served by public transport. The closure of King William Street to traffic except public transport was also supported. However, the effect of road closures on bus routes needed to be given further consideration.

The Highways Department considered changes in the City’s movement system could be to the detriment of the remainder of the metropolitan area and had to be viewed in the wider context although the transport concepts - limiting vehicular traffic, improving public transport and diverting through traffic - were supported in principle. However, phasing was considered critical and the bypass had to be in place before any major road closures could be implemented.

The Fire Brigade also opposed the closure of any roads.

The State Transport Authority objected to the Railway Station being on the list of Registered Places and to any land it controlled being reverted to Park Lands.

The Railways Department was in favour of an inner city circle, not just a north-south route, but it was completely opposed to AP7 (Joie de Vivre) on railway land.

The Tramways Trust commented there were no funds for an extension of the tram or for the removal of the tram depot on Hackney Road.

The Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport supported AP30 (Bikeways) and the provision of Community Centres.

The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust supported a new pedestrian bridge across the Torrens and the proposed car park for 2000 behind Government House.

The University of Adelaide was opposed to any restrictions to developing its North Terrace site and to the listing of the Mitchell Building and Elder Hall.
The South Australian Institute of Technology did not want its plans to move to the East End to be frustrated, and particularly objected to the Market facades being listed and kept.

The Botanic Gardens Board objected to any restrictions on new buildings in Botanic Gardens.

The Public Buildings Department opposed controls being exercised by the City Council, but indicated it would cooperate voluntarily with the proposed Review Committee.

ETSA was concerned at the lack of references to services in the Plan and opposed any restrictions on pruning trees.

EWS Department saw no difficulties from increased demands, but considered early cooperation on all relevant Action Projects would be necessary.

SAHT accepted that it had a role to play in the City but was concerned if this implied any subsidies. It stressed that the purchase and rehabilitation of existing houses was an option rather than just building new public housing.

The Education Department recognised the need for the upgrading and growth of schools if the population targets were going to be met.

The Valuer-General commented that valuations in the City would be easier because of greater certainty in the Plan.

The submission from the SPA argued that it was illogical to plan for the City in isolation from the metropolitan area and this was underlined by several Policies in the Plan itself. It considered the Planning and Development Act, 1966-72 should be amended to overcome the criticisms expressed in the report, but the City Plan should still be a Supplementary Development Plan under the Act as amended. The SPA should replace the Review Committee but, if there was to be one, the SPA should be represented on such a body. The view was also expressed that Heritage should be dealt with as part of new and separate legislation and not as part of the City Plan.
APPENDIX 21
COUNCIL’S ACTION PROJECTS

While negotiations on the City Plan were continuing, the Council reviewed the status of its Action Projects and Programmes. The Town Clerk and all the Heads of Departments (the Executive Committee of the ACC) were invited to participate in the Action Projects where they had an interest and to nominate a staff member for the relevant Project Team. The coordination of the Action Project Programme was delegated to the Deputy City Planner (Currie).

Each Brief prepared defined the Intent and Scope of the Project; its background; relevant aspects of the City Plan; the need for the Project; a work programme; the cost (particularly if consultants were to be used); the Project Director, and the nominated ACC Committee which would have responsibility for the project.291

In May 1975 the Council decided that Action Projects (AP) would be carried out in the following order of priority: AP21 (North Adelaide Village Centre); AP15 (Street Furniture and Graphics); AP27 (Frome Street South); AP19 (Register of Places of Environmental Significance); AP34 (Transportation Planning); AP31 (Property Information Systems); AP1 (Streetscape Improvements); AP28 (Pedestrian Network and Shelter), and AP33 (Parking Programme).292

This selection of Action Projects reflected the ACC’s view of where some early implementation of the City Plan could be achieved. Before commencing the AP1 (Streetscape) a meeting was held with Johinke (Commissioner of Highways); Lewis (Director and Engineer–in-Chief of E&WS); Law (SA Gas); Dinham (ETSA) and Davis (Telecom) to explain the intentions and seek the cooperation of the service departments and agencies. The ACC administration recognised the importance of working collaboratively with the administrative levels of the State and Commonwealth Governments to achieve outcomes.

However, in terms of the community the most important issue was heritage. The Brief for AP19 (Register of Places of Environmental Significance) was adopted on 29 September 1975 and the main task was the preparation of an updated and consolidated list of significant buildings and places.

291 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/S/1.
292 See Minutes of the meeting of the ACC 26 May 1975, p.17.
APPENDIX 22
A CONTINUING ROLE FOR THE CADC

The CADC continued to fulfill its strategic and statutory roles, particularly in relation to development projects, while City/State negotiations proceeded on the City Plan.

The Dunstan Government was returned to office in 1973 on policies which included the transformation of Rundle Street into a Mall (Linn 2006, p.240). Dunstan made it clear through the CADC that the question of Rundle Street becoming a mall was not “if” but “when”. The State became impatient and threatened to put 44 gallon drums at the end of the street unless there was some progress. Clampett as the Lord Mayor had the task of persuading the Council to agree to the Mall despite considerable trader opposition (Bowen, Jim, ohi 3 / 115:118, College Park, 16 April 2007).

A Rundle Mall Steering Committee was established which consisted of two representatives appointed by the State, two appointed by the ACC and two from the Retail Traders Association of South Australia. The traders were concerned that if traffic was removed the retail trade would decline and could disappear and so progress was slow. Having regard to governance, the ACC took the pragmatic position that if the Mall was a fait accompli as a result of Dunstan’s influence, then Rundle Street needed to be developed as the best Mall in the world and a car park would need to be built to support the Mall. On 25 June 1974 the CADC advised Dunstan a preliminary design of Rundle Mall had been reviewed and the concept was supported in principle.293

The CADC invited the new City Planner to attend meetings of the Committee and become familiar with its activities.294 At the first meeting he attended on 16 September 1974 a further report on Rundle Mall was discussed in detail and the major issue was the proposed car park. The ACC members advised that fourteen sites had been evaluated and the preferred site was the former Foy & Gibson building at the south-eastern corner of Pulteney Street and Rundle Street where 800 short term spaces were proposed. In a rare instance of the CADC not having an unanimous view, Bakewell and Stretton voted against supporting this proposal on the basis that they considered the Mall could probably succeed without the need to provide additional short term parking, notwithstanding that the Traders’ support was conditional on the new car park. The CADC also expressed the view that the

293 Adelaide City Archives. Administrative Department File 317/M/2.
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Mall should be ‘busy, colourful and vibrant, with a great deal of variety in character and form’; and that the Mall could be paved more cheaply than the granite finish proposed.295

Don Hopgood (a Minister in Dunstan’s Cabinet and later Deputy Premier) recalls there was an issue in Cabinet over the car park proposed to serve Rundle Mall when Rundle Street was closed to traffic. The ACC was supporting the traders over the need for a new car park and although this was eventually approved, there had been a lot of opposition especially from the Minister of Transport, Geoff Virgo. The Minister had set his face against any further high rise car parks in the City (Hopgood, Don, ohi 26 / 73:83, Morphett Vale, 18 February 2008).

On 20 May 1975 the CADC reviewed the detailed design of the Mall prepared by Hannaford Architects and forwarded comments to the ACC. It also approved the ACC’s application to use the former Foy & Gibson building as a car park to support the Mall. However, it was a condition of approval that retail uses be provided on the ground floor and that the car park be constructed so that it could be used for other purposes, such as offices, at some time in the future. The car park as built is a demountable structure.296 The Mall was eventually completed with brick paving and officially opened by Dunstan on 1 September 1976 in the presence of thousands of people and the Rundle Mall Car Park was eventually opened by Roche on 30 June 1977 (Linn 2006, p.242).

Another project of importance for the CADC was Ruthven Mansions in Pulteney Street. Former Lord Mayor Hayes addressed the CADC on 9 December 1974 about the merits of retaining Ruthven Mansions. Even though new balconies and lifts would be required, he considered it should be an economic proposition and would be an important policy statement about residential use in the City for the State and the ACC.297 On 19 December 1974 Clampett wrote to Dunstan expressing concern that the State was considering the possibility of demolishing Ruthven Mansions which had been built in 1911. Although the building was in a dilapidated state and had not been in residential use for many years, the CADC considered that restoration would be an economic proposition and would demonstrate a commitment to the residential regeneration of the City in accordance with the proposed City Plan.298 Condous (Condous, Steve, ohi 30 / 19:22, Norwood, 1 March 2000) recalls that there
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had been a proposal by a developer to demolish Ruthven Mansions and replace them with a new arcade but Condous gives the credit to Hayes for their retention through his influence with Dunstan.

The ACC decided that it could demonstrate to the private sector the viability of inner city residential development by becoming a housing developer itself (Linn 2006, p.249). Horner designed a scheme of eleven two-storey town houses and the working drawings were prepared by the City Building Surveyor’s Department. The scheme, approved by the CADC, was known as Angas Court in the south-east of the City. All the houses sold quickly and the ACC made a profit.299 The amount of land the ACC had acquired for road widening became a valuable resource for SAHT development. The SAHT had argued that it could not afford city land prices, and deals were done with the ACC. The trade off for subsidised land was the design quality and SAHT homes, while humble, were approved by the CADC and became part of the urban fabric and never looked like public housing (Platten, Newell, ohi 10 / 67:70, Adelaide, 7 May 2007). The CADC’s position was that the desired increase in residential population should not adversely impact on the existing environmental character.300

Arland wrote to the CADC on 3 July 1975 and asked that the CADC have regard to the City Plan adopted by the ACC in its future decision-making.301 The City Planner’s Department was requested by the CADC to prepare a draft Second Statement of Policy for consideration. The First Statement of Policy was revised having regard to the findings of the Planning Study, the City Plan adopted by the ACC and the experience of IDC. The CADC Second Statement of Policy was adopted on 18 July 1975. It was stated in the document that applicants had been invited to discuss proposals with officer’s of the City Planner’s Department before submitting a formal application. All applications and the reports on them had been available to the members of public and press. Land owners likely to be affected by development proposals had been consulted. The Statement was seen as a guide for the remainder of the period of IDC until new statutory controls were introduced. It was stressed that proposals had to comply with general performance standards as there were no detailed requirements prescribed for bulk, plot ratio, site coverage or setbacks. Instead, the CADC wanted proposals to comply with the general statement of environmental objectives for the precincts. This was an unfamiliar approach in Adelaide but the CADC expected developers to cooperate to make it work as such an approach allowed a greater freedom of design and land use while at the same time it imposed neighbourly and environmental requirements which were difficult to codify. The Statement

299 Adelaide City Archives. City Planner’s Department File 63/74.
300 Adelaide City Archives. City Planner’s Department File 66/74.
301 Adelaide City Archives. Town Clerk’s File 656/T/3.
included 14 use groups from ‘house’ to ‘offensive or hazardous industry’ which were ‘Deemed to be approved’; ‘For Consideration on Merit’ or ‘Deemed to be prohibited’ in each zone of all the Precincts (CADC, 1975). Wagner comments the Second Statement of Policy (CADC, 1975) started the process of putting substance to the subtleties of planning controls based on the Planning Study. In a sense the proposed new controls were being trialled and because it was still a policy document and not legislated for, it was a useful means of gauging the likely effectiveness of the new system. It was not such a culture shock as the First Statement of Policy (CADC, 1972) and helped to explain the underlying philosophies of what the CADC had been set up to achieve (Wagner, Geoff, oh! 19 / 84:97, Burnside, 7 November 2007).

Dunstan introduced legislation in the House of Assembly to extend the life of the CADC by six months from 30 June 1976 until 31 December 1976. Dunstan argued:

“Until the Plan is settled it is impossible for the Government to present to Parliament settled proposals for the legislative framework within which the Plan will operate. While proper regard must be made to the unique circumstances of the City of Adelaide, the effect of planning for the City must be viewed in the context of the whole State.”

Planning Directive No. 1 to restrict the use of land to its existing use or lawful approved use had been issued by the CADC and published in the Government Gazette on 14 December 1972. Planning Directive No. 2 to grant an approval for a specified period of time had been issued by the CADC and published in the Government Gazette on 24 October 1974. The legitimacy of these Directives did not arise until there was an appeal against a decision made by the CADC. An application for a minor development in North Adelaide was refused and the applicant took the matter to the Planning Appeals Board where Bowering acted as Counsel for the CADC. Bowering argued strongly that there was no right of appeal against the decision made, the only right of appeal being against the Directive itself. The Planning Appeals Board agreed and the matter was then appealed by the applicant to Judge Roder who upheld the Board’s decision.

The case got some publicity in the media and there was a lot of concern in the community about the CADC’s use of the Directive. The tenacious litigant then appealed to the Land and Evaluation Court where it came before Judge Wells. Judge Wells made some unflattering comments about the Directive but came to the conclusion that the Board was correct but the matter was then appealed to the Full Court. The Court consisted of Judges Roma Mitchell, Howard Zelling and George Walters.

Judge Zelling questioned Bowering closely about the validity of the Directive itself. Judge Mitchell then said that she understood what the Directive was trying to achieve but without expressing any view as to whether the Directive was valid or not disqualified herself as she was a resident of the City. Judge Walters said nothing but as he was a resident of the City he also disqualified himself. The Full Bench, with two new Judges joining Judge Zelling, reconvened the next day and Judge Zelling thought the Directive ‘directed nobody and prevented nothing and was clearly not intended to apply to the whole City’. Bowering thinks this was an illogical view of the Directive but Judge Zelling held sway and judgement was handed down on 18 March 1976 (Bowering, Michael, oii 22 / 40:60, Brighton, 20 November 2007). Planning Directive No. 1 was declared invalid. The CADC immediately set about the task of preparing new Directives to cover the points made by the Full Court and replacement Planning Directives Nos. 3 and 4 were published in the Government Gazette on 6 May 1976 and remained in force until 1 March 1977 when the new legislation for the City came into effect (CADC, 1975).
NOTE:
This appendix is included on page 388 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.
APPENDIX 24
COUNCIL’S REPORT TO CRAFTER ON TOWNSCAPE

The Minister was requested to consider the following:

An item of Townscape which Council believes justifies substantial or partial retention should be listed as a Local Heritage Item forming a schedule to the Regulations under the Act.

The required Regulation amendment be exhibited for one month together with the listing criteria and notification should be sent to owners of all listed properties.

With the exception of those items in respect of which an objection is received, the regulation amendments and schedules be subsequently forwarded to the Governor for approval and gazetted concurrently with the gazetted of the City of Adelaide Plan 1991-96. Any consequential amendment of the draft City of Adelaide Plan 1991–96 be made by the Governor on the advice of the Minister.

An independent Review Body be established by the Minister to consider objections to the proposed Regulation amendments and advise the Minister. Following consideration of that advice by the Minister, further items may be added to the schedule, without delaying gazetted of the new City Plan. The Review Body should include an independent Chair and representatives with a range of skills and experience in design, planning, history, property and valuation.

In areas of Townscape significance, other than where retention of built fabric is considered essential to protect the heritage of the City, the Council should allow redevelopment or infill development to occur, provided this is done having regard to urban design criteria which reinforces and enhances that existing character.
APPENDIX 25
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE STATE PLANNING REVIEW

Within the context of securing an internationally competitive economic base for the State, whilst preserving and enhancing the natural and social environment for South Australia, the Review is to advise the Premier generally of improvements to State and regional-level planning. In particular the review is to advise upon:

Policy objectives for metropolitan Adelaide, including the City of Adelaide, for the next 20 – 25 years, having regard to future economic, social and environmental circumstances.

Strategies required to ensure the successful achievement of such objectives (including critical actions of government, the private sector, Local Government and the community) and their financial implications.

The extent to which revised objectives and strategies should be given statutory effect.

Improvements, in terms of both procedures and structures, to the administration of development controls, particularly in regard to:

. the powers and responsibilities of planning authorities;
. the formulation of planning policy;
. the approval process;
. appeal rights.

The revised planning system should have a greater degree of predictability and be prompt, efficient and responsive to user requirements.

In light of these, desirable amendments to legislation and their financial, administrative and other implications.

The Review should address these matters taking into account the Government's “Planning Policy”, the “Future Directions” statement, “Creating an Environmentally Sustainable Society”, “Social Justice Strategy”, and other relevant statements of Government Policy.

The Review should be open and consultative, allowing adequate opportunities for individual, community, private, Local Government and Government input.

A Reference Group involving representatives from relevant interests will be established to assist the Review.
APPENDIX 26
EAST END MARKETS AND LE CORNU DEVELOMENTS

During the period July until December 1993 the City of Adelaide Planning Commission dealt with a number of projects as the relevant statutory authority. The two major projects considered during these last few months of the Commission were the East End Markets in South Adelaide and Le Cornu in North Adelaide.

East End Markets Development
The Adelaide Fruit and Produce Exchange (East End Markets) was a feature of the City until 1988. Ian Quigley proposed an international hotel and all-suites apartments but it was five storeys over the height limit in the City Plan. Minister Hopgood wrote to the CAPC on 6 August 1987 that the Adelaide Fruit and Produce Exchange was on the State Register and was a heritage item of national importance and recommended refusal.303 None of the schemes proposed for the site came to fruition and when Beneficial Finance collapsed in 1992 the site became a Government asset. Except for the Universal Wine Bar, all the land was owned by the State as it had passed to the State from the demise of Beneficial Finance. The land had been acquired for some $80 million based on completely unrealistic expectations of what could be developed on the site. It was then valued on the Government's books at about $6 – $8 million. The State decided to divide the site into commercial and residential components and Lord Mayor Henry Ninio was responsible for persuading Max Lieberman to return from Sydney and undertake the residential development. The Mancorp Group was interested in the commercial section along Rundle Street East and there was a very complex legal agreement. Minister Crafter was criticised by the Opposition for selling the land too cheaply but it did demonstrate that development could be achieved in the City on a complex and difficult site. In fact some $20 million was returned to the State and the development sparked the rejuvenation of that part of the City. The Minister of Environment and Planning had required a detailed Heritage Study to be carried out before any development proposal could be considered. The Heritage Study proposed a maximum six storeys behind the heritage facades. The Planning Commission approved the redevelopment of the East End Markets as there was a good balance between the renovation of the heritage facades and new residential apartments which were sold “off the plan” – a first for Adelaide (Crafter, Greg, ohi 28 / 41:53, Adelaide, 18 February 2008). (See Figure 38)

Before Lennon left the State he finalised the arrangements between Max Lieberman and Mancorp for the commercial/residential development of Rundle Street East and the old East End Markets site. This was a good example of a joint Action Project to achieve a desired result from a strategic planning approach which could not be achieved by development controls alone.304

**Le Cornu Development**

An application to develop the former Le Cornu site in North Adelaide was taken out of the hands of the Council by Minister Crafter in July 1993 and made the responsibility of the CAPC. The pro-heritage Council, led by Hamilton, was opposed to any commercial development on the site. The approval for a development given by the Planning Commission was challenged in the Supreme Court. While the appeal was eventually dismissed, the Oberdan group then could not raise the necessary funds and the development did not proceed. It had been a lost opportunity and blight on O’Connell Street for the last twenty years. Crafter observes this was an example of how planning legislation had been used to frustrate development rather than facilitate it (Crafter, Greg, oh1 28 / 35:41, Adelaide, 18 February 2008).

Hodgson recalls the decision by the Minister Crafter, to “call in” the application for the redevelopment of the Le Cornu site in North Adelaide which was then before the Council. The pro-heritage faction wanted to have a significant residential component as part of the development. But the Oberdan group had paid full market value for a commercial redevelopment site given the zoning and a large residential component was economically unviable. This started ringing alarm bells in Cabinet about commercial development in the City and the attitude of the Council to Townscape (Hodgson, John, oh1 32/ 96:102, Adelaide, 11 March 2008).

Davis suspects that Lord Mayor Henry Ninio had something to do with Minister Crafter taking the assessment of the application for the Le Cornu site out of the hands of the Council and making the CAPC the relevant authority.305 After a great deal of consultation and compromise, the CAPC had arrived at a compromise solution for the site and issued an approval. However, before the developer could start work the North Adelaide Society took Judicial Review proceedings in the Supreme Court. By the time the matter was resolved, the bottom had fallen out of the property market and with all the additional expenses to do with the appeal, Vince Oberdan lost his financial backers and the scheme

---

304 State Records. City of Adelaide Planning Commission, File no. 17/86
305 Davis was correct in her assumption. The researcher was present at a meeting between Ninio and Lennon when the Lord Mayor demanded that Minister Crafter intervene and take the application out of the hands of the Council.
was never built. Davis recalls that Ninio as Chairman refused to sign confirmed Minutes of the CAPC because he personally did not agree with something in them about the Le Cornu decision (Davis, Helen, ohi 40 / 54:57, North Adelaide, 26 May 2008). Jose recalls the negotiated scheme for the former Le Cornu site in North Adelaide. The scheme was approved by the Commission with three storeys to O'Connell and Archer Streets and with four and five storeys in the middle of the site. This was a generous solution for the developer (Oberdan) in terms of the fine grain form of North Adelaide (Jose, Jane, ohi 45 / 49:52, Adelaide, 2 May 2008).

Payze observes the original Le Cornu application had not met the parameters of the *City Plan* but the CAPC looked at the commercial realities once the Minister made the Commission the planning authority. There were negotiations with the applicant to arrive at an acceptable scheme and there was consultation with the key stakeholders such as the North Adelaide Society. The CAPC felt there was enough community support for the compromise scheme to be approved and the view had been taken that something had to happen on such a key site in the City (Payze, Rod, ohi 44 / 71:77, Hyde Park, 19 May 2008).

At the time of writing this dissertation it is noted the Le cornu site is still vacant.