

DTI:Planning Review

From: Matt Slater [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, 29 November 2022 3:06 PM
To: DTI:Planning Review
Subject: Submission

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

Dear Sir/Madam

I am the registered proprietor of two blocks of land each approx 26 hectares on Ruskin Road, Dublin which is just off the Port Wakefield highway approximately 60 kms from Adelaide, 505 minute drive from King William Street. The land is zoned coastal conservation.

My submission covers the topics of the Native Vegetation Act and land subdivision.

I originally had 120 hectares at this location but came into an agreement with the Department of Environment a few years ago upon my approach whereby they would acquire the landlocked salt pans in the back half of my block and incorporate it into the Adelaide Bird Sanctuary and they would support two new titles being created with wide frontage to bitumised Ruskin Road, each block having approximately 1km.

The Department of Environment were not interested in purchasing the rest of my land because upon a site visit they determined it contained little environmental value as it had been used for grazing and cropping in the past.

Native Vegetation

Last year I put in an application for a caravan park on one of the two blocks closer to Dublin, it was to be located on what had been the entrance to the 120 hectare block and had a garage located on that land plus long driveway and also an oval shaped dirt track clearly visible from satellite imagery. I was then shocked when the Native Vegetation consultant informed me that the clearance costs for the two hectares would be in the realm of \$30K per hectare and that would be the approximate figure for the rest of the property.

The issue I then have is that the native veg clearance cost is more than the market value of the land per hectare which is around \$10K. How can this be? The effect of the native veg legislation is to lock up my land and make it uneconomic for any use other than grazing and cropping and that is only if it is continued with otherwise I lose the right to even to use it for that purpose, FOR NO COMPENSATION, and have to reapply which no sane person would do because the cost of native veg re approval would likely be more than the market value of grazing land.

To my mind the native veg levy must always be a portion of the market value of the land where the land vegetation does not contain any commonwealth protected flora and fauna. The native veg on my block is no different in general terms from land stretching in either direction for hundreds of kms. I find this to be completely ludicrous. The effect of the native vegetation act is to tie up most of SA regional land and makes it uneconomic to contemplate any change of use of it unless the land is being subdivided.

If the Native Veg board says my land has a value of \$30K per hectare then it should be prepared to buy the land off me at that price.

The Native Veg Act also has an offset provision which does not work because the cost of having the professional expertise to set up an area for which credits can be obtained is very onerous and a multiple of the native veg levy that is being attempted to be avoided. If that was not enough there is inherent taxation system in the native veg approval system whereby a \$1 of accepted native veg value created is discounted to pay for the operation of the Native Veg authority. Who ever voluntary submits themselves to being taxed?

The rigmarole that farmers have to go through, paperwork and expert reports, to even change the type of livestock is ridiculous and inhibits farmers experimenting in the face of climate change as it requires in effect farmers to know what the results of their experimentation to be able to get the necessary permission from Native Veg to experiment.

Subdivision

There is a housing affordability and rental crisis in this state.

Cheap residential land is urgently required to be released to address this and that can only be provided on the fringes, suburban infill land is a lot more expensive and the cost of upgrading services for infill would I venture be higher than providing those services on the fringe particularly with technological innovation such as solar panels and batteries.

There is an increasing demand for rural lifestyle blocks with more and more working time being spent working from home and people want to work from home on a 1 hectare block rather than on your average residential sized block.

Given the way the planning rules in this state it is only the big developers, including LandSA, who are able to create this new land and it's in their interests to undersupply the market so that they can make super profits which means the blocks are expensive.

Riverlea about 20kms up the road to Adelaide is selling 500 sqm blocks for \$230K or thereabouts. By the time a basic house is put on it then a total investment of a minimum of \$500-\$550K is required.

My land is flat, won't flood unlike Buckland Park, won't burn, has no significant trees, is a couple of kms from Thompson Beach in one direction and a few kms from Dublin in the other direction, just off the main highway, commuting distance to the Northern suburbs of Adelaide and the City, has low agriculture value, is on the coast where people want to live, Adelaide Plains council itself recognises land needs to be released around the Dublin area but the coastal conservation zoning states that subdivision is not a permitted use. WHY? It should be a permitted use because that is where the demand for land lies, people want to live and play on the coast. Land division should be a permitted use for all coastal conservation land.

Hundreds of metres up the road closer to Dublin 1 hectare blocks sell for \$200K and yet each of my 25 hectare blocks only have a market value of \$250-\$300K. Its absurd and demonstrates how the planning system in this state distorts market value.

In my opinion I should be able to create 20 one hectare blocks, 10 per existing block, with each new block having 100sqm frontage to a bitumised main road. I would be more than happy to set up a 35 hectare buffer zone behind these blocks to be the interface with the Adelaide Bird Sanctuary. This would be a win:win type development which the current zoning does not allow. Families would be able to buy for the same price a block of land that is 20 times the size of a riverlea block and actually be able to experience the feeling of space and freedom with their kids being able to grow up being energetic and resourceful rather than living on a small block with no room for a decent sized garage let alone swimming pool or bike riding area.

You should be judged on whether any reforms you make to the planning system make what I propose achievable and give what young families in this state are desperately seeking, a choice to a pathetic 400-500 sqm overpriced block in a large residential subdivision on the suburban fringe.

Regards

Matt Slater

[Redacted]

[Redacted]