

**REFERENCE: The Messenger – Portside Wednesday 05 May 2004,  
Page 13**

### **POOR CORPORATE IMAGE**

I would like to first say that I do appreciate the considerable benefits the development of the Port at Outer Harbour will have for the economy of South Australia.

However, I am very disappointed in the approach Flinders Ports has taken regarding the loss of heritage and amenity in this area.

Flinders Port has made no real attempt when asked to get involved in the renovation of the Mission to Seamens Hall.

The significant heritage value of this building should be considered to be more important than the relatively few car spaces gained from its demolition. It should not be left to the elements of nature to destroy it.

There has been considerable comment in the media about the poor facilities available to passengers embarking from cruise ships at Outer Harbour. A renovated Seamens Hall could provide excellent reception facilities.

Large areas which have been enjoyed by Lefevre Peninsula residents and those from all over Adelaide have been lost to Port development, and considerably more will be lost in the future.

Flinders Ports has been approached about a number of projects which would give some amenity back to the area, eg, an extension of the Aldinga to North Haven path along the breakwater to the North Haven beach, increasing the size of the public car park near the Signal Station, planting trees and shrubs along Oliver Rogers Rd.

However it has shown no interest in the concerns of the local community.

Flinders Ports also showed no interest when asked to unload cars from semi-trailers on their land, rather than the dangerous practices of unloading cars on the main road.

Flinders Ports has a poor corporate image in the Outer Harbour area.

It needs to show some initiative, imagination and drive to give amenity back to the people of Adelaide.

CR PETER JAMIESON  
Outer Harbour Ward

Port Adelaide Enfield Council

Ongoing bridge debate

Not everybody thought the Port Adelaide Football Club should seek admission to the AFL.

Some thought it should stick to a good thing and keep fielding successful teams in the SANFL.

Similarly, not everyone thinks that road and rail bridges over the Port River are good ideas, at least not so close to a major maritime, tourism and future residential area.

Bridges are what we're getting however. The important thing is that they open.

The South Australian Freight Council is quite wrong in stating that there is no justifiable economic argument.

It ignores the current and future tourism benefit to the state from national and international visitors interested in maritime history.

Freight is not the economic beginning and end. The freight council has been trying to persuade government ministers that a ``vocal minority" is controlling the debate about whether the bridges should be fixed or open.

The council is the vocal minority. The Port is important to, and beloved by, the whole state of South Australia and beyond, as was demonstrated last Easter when thousands of signatures were easily gained from visitors who were astounded and outraged at the idea that fixed bridges would remove the pleasure of viewing tugs, war ships and tall ships, and would deny access to local yachties.

Kevin Foley, his Cabinet colleagues and other local members all understand that it is not just a local, vocal minority who believe in the importance of the historical, cultural and social values of Port Adelaide.

A.T. HASTINGS  
Exeter