



CROP SCIENCE SOCIETY OF SA INCORPORATED

C/- Waite Campus
PMB No 1, Glen Osmond, South Australia 5064
ABN 68 746 893 290

Planing Reform Submissions
DIT
State Planning Commission

Email: DIT.PlanningReformSubmissions@sa.gov.au

17th December 2020

Re: Revised Planning & Design Codes Consultation

The implementation of planning codes by Local Government planning departments/boards in peri-urban (Country Adelaide) areas is leading to significant & long lasting issues for broadacre grain growers. These issues have in the past been coined "unintended consequences". But, unfortunately as the corrections are yet to be made and the issues are still occurring, they can no longer be considered unintended.

A selection of Crop Science Society member issues is summarized as follows;

Incompatible land uses (eg tourism developments) where noise, odour, dust, smoke are not acceptable emissions from land practices are being approved adjacent broadacre grain production areas.

The requirement for existing grain production businesses to adjust their work practices to suit new incompatible developments.

Buffer zones applied on broadacre growers are unworkable when multiple sides of land are adjacent to sensitive crop types (viticulture/horticulture) or incompatible land uses (urban).

An inability of councils to assist in landholders to resolve weed control issues within broadacre land adjacent vineyard/horticulture developments, including declared weeds.

Broadacre growers being forced to use sub-standard and often more costly weed control measures to limit risk of damage to adjacent/nearby sensitive species & incompatible land uses.

Broadacre growers are regularly forced to risk legal consequences by intentionally applying chemicals against label directions ("DO NOT", "AVOID") or are applying during high risk periods to reduce risk of detection by sensitive neighbours.

Approvals for value add or land improvements regularly demonstrate a bias against broadacre developments.

Eg 1. Farm machinery shed hayshed and hay plant rated a category 3 development whereas comparable wine storage sheds rated as category 1.

Eg 2. Hayshed not considered “value adding” but a gin distillery application was.

Eg 3. Hayshed doesn’t fit with character, but visible warehouse storage facilities are considered acceptable.

Eg 4. Hayshed & hayplant over 1km from Highway was required to have suitable screening of the facility by trees, but wine tanks and wine storage sheds are not consistently required to provide such screening.

Eg 5. Intensive animal industry development (sheep & pigs) applications in the Barossa region were too restrictive, so property was purchased in the SE to facilitate the business instead.

Eg 6. Viticultural development allowed to access surface water via new dam development with catchment for irrigation, whilst broadacre cannot modify a watercourse or waterway.

Finally, as an aside, the new E-Planning platform shows many valuable layers of information. Unfortunately, though it contains the SA Power Networks (SAPN) electric distribution network, it appears to be lacking other providers (eg Electranet).

Should you seek further opinion on, or clarification of these matters, I am very happy to discuss these with you and provide fuller feedback for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Craig Davis".

Craig Davis.