This submission form is being used to collect feedback from practitioners and the community on the Planning and Design Code in the outback (land not within a council area). It will help us consolidate comments under specific themes so that we can more easily identify trends and consider feedback according to the zone, overlay or general module to which it applies. Your input will ensure that the new planning and development rules for the outback meet the planning needs of rural South Australians and address planning issues relevant to land outside of council boundaries.

Please send your completed submission form to:

Jason Bailey, Project Lead Planning and Design Code
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure
Level 5, 50 Flinders Street, Adelaide 5000
GPO Box 1815, Adelaide SA 5001
Email: DPTI.PlanningEngagement@sa.gov.au

Section one: About you

1. Are you a planning, design or building industry professional?
   ☒ Yes
   ☐ No

   If yes, please choose the professional field that best describes you from the drop-down list below:

   Planning

2. Are you lodging this submission on behalf of yourself or an organisation?

   ☒ Organisation
   ☐ Self

   If you are lodging a submission on behalf of an organisation, please provide the name of your organisation below:

   Conservation Council of SA Inc. (Conservation SA)

3. What council (or non-council) area do you typically reside in?

   Adelaide CC

4. If you wish to receive a report on the feedback received during this consultation, please provide your name and email address.

   Name: iris iwanicki

   Email: iris.iwanicki@sa.gov.au
Section two: Feedback on the Planning and Design Code in the outback

5. Please provide your feedback on any or all of the Code sections outlined below.

PART 1 – RULES OF INTERPRETATION

PART 2 - ZONES AND SUBZONES

Noted that at this stage there are no sub-zones
It may be relevant to consider areas within the outback that are severely stressed by long term drought, overstocking and reliance on the Great Artesian Basin for sustaining stock that an overlay of productive areas contain policies regarding protection of sub artesian water resources, mound springs and their unique botany, significant Aboriginal sites outside of dedicated reserves (or provide a policy that can address this in the Zone provisions given the sensitivity of location.) For these reasons, comments are provided in the following to suggest ways of addressing the lack of policies
Also should Woomera Township and Range be a subzone? Defence control the township, airport and testing ground, and also co-exist with mining, and pastoral land uses. However, there is a SAPOL and SA Education presence in the township – how is development handled at a state level?
Should there be a subzone on the Woomera Range for storage of low level and medium radioactive waste? (There is a depository there already—should this be acknowledged as a change of land use, given the Range is for the development of war materiel, not domestic and medical radioactive waste.)
Some acknowledgement of the diversity and overlap of different land uses could or should be further explored, in terms of what entity takes priority for certain areas? How would Defence view a subzone for Woomera Township as a Tourist overlay? The function and history of the Woomera settlement has high tourism and cultural potential as the sole surviving example of Australia’s Cold War planned remote settlements, combining Modernist planning principles in a hybrid social combination of civilian and military personnel/workers. As such it is unique in Australian Cold War history. Has this been considered?

Coastal Waters Zone

The limitation of 1000 m. distance from any reserve under the NP&W Act (presumably this includes marine reserves??) should exclude Ministerial discretion to allow a lesser distance. Much depends on tidal and current conditions, which may also affect the efficacy of a 1000m buffer distance if the tides and currents are directed towards reserve areas.
PO 1.2 ‘pollution’ should be added to the reference to turbidity and this principle.
No public notification? CCSA is concerned over the approach to limit public consultation, given the use of ‘minimise’ development’s impacts of potential turbidity and sedimentation’ caused by a development proposal. While this Zone does not involve a large area of coastal land, consideration should be given to reviewing the policies relating to coastal waters with the programs run by CCSA and like bodies, including volunteer groups, the fishing industry and recreational fishers. OR alternatively, review the Code’s prohibition on public notification, All developments involve different ‘fact and degree’ characteristics that the current policies do not provide clear guidance about. This is reflected in the accompanying table, which the public as well as related government agencies should be able to assist with.
**Conservation Zone**

Suggest consideration of significant wetlands and water points to be included within Conservation and allied Zoning. The Arckaringa Hills Heritage Area (State), mound springs, could be provided with clearer policies regarding development as a sub-zone but also acknowledged as an additional principle within the Conservation Zone? For example:

Insert P.1.3 Development avoids areas that impact on mound springs and associated biota.

Reason: The GAB mound springs have very high biological and cultural significance. Many of the species are found only in Australia. While the Far North Water Allocation Plan under the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 addresses activity restrictions (exclusion zones) in proximity to springs and clusters, it is submitted that an additional policy should address the need to protect native threatened species and the mound springs.

Landscaping and Hazard Risk sections – No mention of climate change policies regarding placement, design and species to adapt to increasing temperatures?

**Local Infrastructure (Airfield) Zone**

Supported – most pastoral properties have airfield and emergency services requirements for access and safety procedures important.

**Remote Areas Zone**

The provisions for carports seem excessive given the nature and function of carports in the remote area zone.

**Settlement Zone**

No comment

**Specific Use (Tourism Development) Zone**

Desired Outcome – Very limited in scope. There is no mention of the need to locate tourism development in appropriate areas to avoid adverse impacts on the biota of arid environments or to consider climate change responsiveness in design and function. Suggest addition of safety for tourist experience. Procedural Matters: Performance Assessed notification – add petrol station, workshop, licensed entertainment venue, sports facilities to the land uses that require public notification.

**Township Zone**

Restrictions on floor area of outbuildings may be contrary to the need for shading of vehicles in outback towns considering the climate.

**PART 3 - OVERLAYS**
The overlays can be confused with the mapping with respect to the latter. Consider having bold text, provide a key on each overlay to clearly indicate what different colours mean, and it would help to provide main routes and settlements as a standard format on all relevant maps to help orientate the outback areas and extent of overlays.

This comment refers to the heading Mapping below. Clear instructions and training sessions (probably through libraries and online) will be essential for public access and use of the Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlay</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Near Airfields Overlay</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Areas Overlay</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards (Acid Sulfate Soils) Overlay</td>
<td>Needs expanding – there is no referral body. Nor is there a definition of Acid Sulphate soils. Is there adequate information for planners to assess whether this is a relevant consideration?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards (Bushfire Protection) Overlay</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Shipwrecks Overlay</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Outback and Rural Routes Overlay</td>
<td>No comment – consider the base for all overlays showing the key outback and rural routes. Consider advice regarding pastoral lease access requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Railway Corridors Overlay</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Parks (Managed Use) Overlay</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Parks (Restricted Use) Overlay</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray-Darling Basin Overlay</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No comment

Prescribed Watercourses Overlay

No comment

Prescribed Wells Area Overlay

No comment – refer to previous comments re mound springs and other water resources for pastoral industry

Ramsar Wetlands Overlay

See above

River Murray Flood Plain Overlay

No comment

Significant Landscape Protection Overlay

No comment

Sloping Land Overlay

No comment

State Heritage Area Overlay

No comment

State Heritage Place Overlay

No comment

Water Resources Overlay

No comment

PART 4 - GENERAL MODULES

Click here to enter text.

Advertisements

Noted – no comment
Animal Keeping and Horse Keeping

Noted – no comment

Aquaculture

No comment - refer to earlier comments re Coastal

Bulk Handling and Storage Facilities

Noted - no comment

Clearance from Overhead Powerlines

Noted – no comment

Design and Siting

Click here to enter text.

Forestry

Not relevant in outback areas

Infrastructure and Renewable Energy Facilities

No comment

Intensive Animal Keeping and Dairies

No comment – although public notification is recommended

Interface between Land Uses

There should be some way of enabling neighbours in a separate zone to comment on the application. In this way specific concerns regarding hours of operation, noise, pollution and amenity can be considered by the Panel, as most panel members do not inspect the development site as a group and the interface impacts may not be fully understood by the assessor/decision maker. Probably not relevant for the Outback Code (depends on feedback though) but a big issue in the current system. Panels may choose to disregard this aspect in favour of economic development, or other planning considerations if uninformed by neighbours. Please reconsider.

Land Division

supported

Marinas and On-Water Structures
Further consideration given for stakeholder consultation?

Mineral Extraction

Click here to enter text.

Open Space and Recreation

No comment

Residential Liveability

No comment

Site Contamination

No comment

Tourism Development

No comment

Transport, Access and Parking

No comment

Waste Treatment and Management Facilities

No comment

Workers Accommodation and Settlements

No comment

PART 5 - MAPPING

This section is very difficult to navigate – little clear guidance provided, details lacking include key, clear graphics and lettering, and it is suggested instructions on how to use the mapping is in some incorporated in the portal. The mapping is clearly a work in progress. If the public and planners are to access mapping with ease, a list of instructions would assist on how to switch from one to other map

PART 6 – LAND USE DEFINITIONS

Inadequate – eg explanation of ‘undiscovered’ and ‘discovered’ re shipwrecks, acid sulphate soils, etc etc

PART 7 – ADMINISTRATIVE DEFINITIONS
PART 8 – REFERRALS TO OTHER AUTHORITIES OR AGENCIES

Suggest that advisory feedback from authorities enable further negotiation with the applicants to address relevant issues involved in assessment of the DA. Power of direction if for refusal – leaves the assessor with no choice but to refuse. Then to whom is the respondent if the applicant appeals against a refusal?

PART 9 — TABLE OF AMENDMENTS

No content, no comment

Section three: Evaluation of this engagement

Please tell us if you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. I feel well-informed about the proposed Planning and Design Code for the outback (land not within a council area).

   Somewhat agree

   If not, why not? What information was missing?

   As a first contact, the Code’s structure is revealed. This is a document that is very complex for it involves as much in terms of cross referencing as existing development plans, within a system of layers of accreditation in the regulations. However, the intent to have all information on the Zone cross referenced should work well in being able to access all information when finalised.

   The public will need a lot of educating that the Minister for Planning not local government clearly controls the state’s planning system.

   Information missing: clear Climate Change policies, biodiversity and landscape capability assessment. Desired outcomes are terse, and need to acknowledge wider issues of sustainability and Climate Change trends are recommended in each Desired Outcome statement in each Zone if the policy is to reflect future challenges that will affect where and how development will occur.

   The CCSA remains concerned over the Code’s overall removal of public /owner notification for performance assessed development assessment. This is a political issue rather than a planning one and the implementation of the Code as it stands will probably continue to draw public comment over the lack of participatory input into development to the government of the day. There is strong representation from CCSA member bodies, such as the National Trust and the Community Alliance regarding this issue.

   In a planning sense, the ability to contribute comment in assessing developments involving public areas such as coastal developments, areas of conservation and heritage overlays, RAMSAR wetlands and GAB mound springs with respect to the development of new tourism facilities, and precious water resources would address the public interest.

   Further opportunity to provide more detailed comment in the next phases would be welcome;
2. The information provided on the new Planning and Design Code for the outback was clear and understandable and enabled me to take an informed view.

Somewhat disagree

If not, what was unclear and how could we have made it easier to understand?

In response to the presentation on the 20th, by those who attended the workshop on the Code:

Submit that a review of the text to identify what needs a clear definition for the public be considered-- perhaps take a non planner to go through and identify what they do not understand, and then consider adding to the section on definitions. Or advise reference to a specific dictionary for further explanation.
The first step, understanding the way the Code is structured is a start, prior to working through the policies in each zone and the linkages to relevant principles and mapping.
Definitely need to have a 'how to navigate the Code’ step by step manual. With respect to all the hard work that has gone into drafting, the Code in its current form is incomplete but this is positive in that through the three releases it is understood that public input will continue to be considered and responded to; for each of the 3 Codes? .Would there be some way of combining overlays with the mapping visually rather than having to click on a number of links?

3. I understand how the Planning and Design Code may affect me and/or my community.

Somewhat disagree

If not, what further information would have been useful to better understand how you might be affected by the draft State Planning Policies?

People at the workshop on the 20th found it difficult, despite Jason’s most capable presentation. This is understandable, given it is the first time they have been connected with the draft. For the layperson, an explanation of what constitutes development should be provided up front.

Further, there is little policy related to climate change- can this be further consulted and reviewed please?

Suggest face to face training sessions – and consider the population that doesn’t have a computer in their possession. If the Code can result in a good search

4. I understand how my feedback will be used in the preparation of the final Planning and Design Code for the outback (land not within a council area).

Strongly agree

If not, tell us how we can better communicate with you about how your feedback will be used.

Consult with the CCSA Inc. as it is an umbrella organisation for many state volunteer organisations devoted to caring for the environment. We hope to access relevant members on specific aspects of the Code in future discussions, workshops in order to provide appropriate feedback to the Commission.

5. I feel that I have had a genuine and adequate opportunity to have my say on the proposed Planning and Design Code for the outback (land not within a council area).

Somewhat agree

Submission form: Planning and Design Code in the outback (land not within a council area)
If not, please tell us how we can improve our engagement with the community and what further opportunities you would like to have input.

Conservation SA thanks DPTI for providing a presentation for members on the 20\textsuperscript{th} March. Further opportunities to work through the implications of Climate Change and management of publicly accessible areas and zones would be welcome.

6. I would be willing to participate in future consultations related to the Planning and Design Code.

Strongly agree

If not, please tell us what would prevent you from participating in future consultations related to planning policy.

The above is subject to time constraints given the range of released public consultation documents eg Landscapes SA draft legislation.