



Regional Planning  
Directions

planning • policies • projects

PO Box 67, Springton SA 5235

p. [REDACTED] m. [REDACTED]

[www.regionalplanningdirections.com.au](http://www.regionalplanningdirections.com.au)

ABN 80 152 935 852

28<sup>th</sup> February 2020

Mr. Michael Lennon  
Chairman  
State Planning Commission

Dear Michael,

RE: SUBMISSION ON PHASE 3 OF THE PLANNING & DESIGN CODE - STRUCTURE  
& PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

Thank you for the opportunity to make comment on Phase 3 of the Planning and Design Code. My comments relate to the readability and policy hierarchy implicit to the way the Zone sections have been structured, plus the need for continuous improvement particularly in relation to intensive animal husbandry and other rural industries in order to extend the benefits of the deemed to satisfy process to the rural sector.

One can be forgiven for thinking that the Zones are mainly about the list of development classes within the tables for Accepted Development, Deemed to Satisfy, and Performance Assessed Development. This effectively turns the previous order of Zone policy on its head and does not reflect the fact that the various categories of development should in effect be subservient to the relative purpose of the zone as expressed in the Assessment Provisions.

In my opinion it would be preferable to place the four tables just above the Procedural section of the zone and have the policies just under the heading of the zone. It may also be an improvement to have the policies within policy tables, which have a heading explaining the code logic and relevance of the various policies to each other and to the general policies that apply to unlisted classes of development.

In my opinion the workload involved in delivering such a massive reform and policy set is showing its strain and is likely to have constrained the policy approach. That is, the full potential for crafting policy and developing deemed to satisfy criteria for a more diverse range of development to simplify development assessment is unlikely to have been realized. This is particularly the case in relation to the intensive animal husbandry area as not even one deemed to satisfy class of development involving intensive animal husbandry has been included in the Rural Zone.

Therefore the improvements to this development category are likely to amount to little more than incremental. As such it is recommended that a policy task group be established to address process improvements and in particular to extend the deemed to satisfy provisions to various classes of intensive animal husbandry. If necessary this on going review should consider amendments to the definition of intensive animal husbandry and to the referral requirements in order to facilitate extending the benefits to rural industries.

In view of the above it is respectfully requested that the State Planning Commission consider the suggested improvements to the structure of policies at the zone level, and establish a task group to undertake research and identify continuous improvement opportunities to extend the benefits of the code to the rural economy. Should you have any questions in relation to the above please do not hesitate to contact me on [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] or via email: [REDACTED]

Yours faithfully



Henri Mueller

**DIRECTOR – REGIONAL PLANNING DIRECTIONS**