Q1 Which part of the Planning and Design Code would you like to make a submission about? (Please click the circle to select which part of the Code you wish to comment on. You can also see which council areas are included in the rural and urban code via the links below.)

My submission relates to Rural code. (click here for council areas)

Q2 Please provide your contact details below (Name, Postcode & Email are mandatory) Please be advised that your submission will be made publicly available on the SA Planning Portal.

Name: Ray
Company: Green Gold Energy
Address: 105 King William Street
Suburbs/Town: Kent Town
State: SA
Postcode: 5067
Country: Australia
Email Address: [Redacted]

Q3 Which sector do you associate yourself with?

Business

Q4 Would you like to make comment on

Respondent skipped this question

Q5 Enter your feedback for Rules of Interpretation

Respondent skipped this question
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Enter your feedback for Referrals</th>
<th>Respondent skipped this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Enter your feedback for Mapping</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Enter your feedback for Table of Amendments</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Please enter your feedback for overlays click next at the bottom of the page for next topic</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Please enter your feedback for zones and subzones click next at the bottom of the page for next topic</td>
<td>Respondent skipped this question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Discussion Paper on Proposed Changes to Renewable Energy Policy in the Planning Design Code are introducing new guidelines to provide policy guidance for the construction of large-scale solar farms. These policies introduce a 500 metre solar farm setback from conservation areas, a 100 meter setback from township boundaries and a 20 meter setback from neighbouring land, no matter the solar farm size or location would be.

With the uptake of renewable energy, there are currently numerous solar farm projects under development throughout South Australia, ranging from 30kW up to 200MW+. The proposed guidelines seem to be trying to cover all sizes and scenarios for solar farm development, instead of making guidelines tailored to meet requirements for different system sizes and locations. We have been developing solar farms in SA ranging from 1MW to 5MW in size which should be a whole different story from larger systems like 100MW. A 1MW solar farm would normally take 5 acres of land and 5MW usually around 30 acres. And for majority of our projects, the land adjacent to our site normally would have no residents, and is just vacant land. Adding those setback requirements would be totally unnecessary and make most of our projects unviable and there's no way we could make SA 100% renewable by 2030. In our experience, the landowners who have undertaken solar farm developments in the range of 1MW to 5MW have done so with the intention of reactivating redundant land parcels which are no longer viable for traditional farming; and in many cases a 30 metre setback would be a barrier for the development moving forward. I would like to see the State Planning Commission take a closer look at the impacts of these setbacks on small business owners - particularly surrounding the use of the available land in rural areas - with particular consideration for the size, location and nature of the developments. The currently proposed policies would not work for smaller solar farms but would only make the energy transition much harder.

Respondent skipped this question
Q13 Please enter your feedback for Admin Definitions and click next at the bottom of the page for next topic

Respondent skipped this question
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Q14 Please enter your general feedback here

Respondent skipped this question
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Q15 Do you have any attachments to upload? (pdf only)

Respondent skipped this question