AGENDA

1. WELCOME

2. ATTENDANCE RECORD
   2.1 Present
   2.2 Apologies
   2.3 Not Present/Leave of Absence
      Cr Scotty Milne
3. MINUTES

3.1 Confirmation of Minutes from the 17 March 2015 meeting.

3.2 Business Arising from Minutes

4. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

5. MATTERS LYING ON THE TABLE/DEFERRED

Nil.

6. QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

7. MOTIONS ON NOTICE

Nil.

8. DEPUTATIONS AND VISITORS TO THE MEETING

Nil.

9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

9.1 Lyndoch Residential Development Plan Amendment - Advice of Approval 12

9.2 Kalbeeba Infill Investigations Study - Progress Report 20

9.3 Strategic Directions Report Implementation and Other Projects - Update Report 58

9.4 Rural Areas and Character Development Plan Amendment - Statement of Intent and Project Update Report 63
10. ITEMS FOR INFORMATION
   Nil.

11. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS
   Nil.

12. OTHER BUSINESS
   Nil.

13. NEXT MEETING
   Tuesday, 15 December 2015 commencing at 9.30pm.

14. CLOSE OF MEETING
1 WELCOME
Mayor Sloane declared the meeting open at 10.05am.

2.1 MEMBERS PRESENT
Mayor Bob Sloane, Crs Dave de Vries, John Angas, Christopher Harms, Leonie Boothby, Richard Miller, Mark Grossman, Scotty Milne, Margaret Harris, Michael (Bim) Lange, Michael Seager and Tony Hurn.

Mr Martin McCarthy (Chief Executive Officer), Mr Ian Baldwin (Director – Development & Environmental Services), Mrs Joanne Thomas (Director – Corporate & Community Services), Mr Peter Bice (Director – Works & Engineering), Mr Louis Monteduro (Senior Manager, Planning Services), Mr Paul Mickan (Principal Planner), Mr Brian Irvine (Senior Planner) and Mrs Marie Thom (Minute Secretary).

2.2 APOLOGIES
Nil.

2.3 LEAVE OF ABSENCE
Nil.

Mr Paul Mickan advised the newly elected members the purpose of the Strategic Planning and Development Committee and the Elected Members role on the Committee.
3.1 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

MOVED Cr de Vries
That the Minutes of the Strategic Planning and Development Policy Committee held on Tuesday 24 June 2014 as circulated, be confirmed as a true and correct record of the proceedings of that meeting.

Seconded Cr Seager  CARRIED

3.2 BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES
Nil.

4 DECLARATION OF INTEREST
Nil.

5 MATTERS LYING ON THE TABLE/DEFERRED
Nil.

6 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Nil.

7 MOTIONS ON NOTICE
Nil.

8 DEPUTATIONS AND VISITORS TO THE MEETING
Nil.
9 ITEMS FOR DECISION

9.1 ECONOMIC REFORMS – ACTIVITY CENTRE AND SHOPPING CENTRE REVIEW DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS (B595)

MOVED Cr Milne
That the Senior Manager, Planning Services be authorised to prepare a submission on the “Preliminary Draft – Principles for activity centres and activity centre uses” on the basis of issues raised in this report and further analysis by staff.

Seconded Cr Miller
CARRIED

COMMENT
Cr Miller
The Minister for Planning has written to Council to advise that he believes existing retail policies across Greater Adelaide are outdated and that Development Plans contain overly restrictive controls and inconsistent procedural requirements. Accordingly the Minister has commenced a review of these policies which he will implement through two Development Plan Amendments (DPAs).

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has prepared a preliminary draft ‘guiding principles’ which will inform the review and associated directions for activity centres and shopping development. The Minister is seeking comments on the draft principles which are due by 27 March 2015.

The process will undoubtedly involve an analysis of retail policies in The Barossa Council Development Plan which, as demonstrated through the recent Strategic Directions Report (SDR) process, generally are not restrictive, are conducive to investment and which promote mixed use. Despite this, the SDR identified several aspects for review including the hierarchy of the Angaston, Nuriootpa and Tanunda activity centres, retail policies in Mount Pleasant, and ‘currency’ of concept plans for various centres. A Townships Review and associated DPA to be commenced in the next few months will address several of these matters. The Minister’s review might also focus on our Commercial Zone including existing policies relating to fast food outlets and the types of retailing envisaged in that zone.

The draft guiding principles contained in the Preliminary Draft – Principles for activity centres and activity centre uses document have been reviewed and it is recommended the following comments be provided to the Minister:

- While ongoing change is taking within the retailing ‘landscape’ any response must recognise that differences exist between rural communities and the metropolitan area within the Greater Adelaide region.
- Retail needs may vary between metropolitan, regional and rural areas within the Greater Adelaide region.
- The guiding principles imply that existing ‘edges’ to existing activity centres will be expanded – what does this mean for country towns? Unlimited expansion of activity centres and/or introduction of new areas where retail and business development could occur has potential to adversely impact on township character.
- Removal of floor space limits could lead to buildings of a scale which are out of character with small scale townships.
- Any revised activity centre and commercial area policies must also incorporate urban design principles to ensure future development respects local character and does not result in sterilised non-active street frontages.
- Existing local policies which respond to local community concerns should not be discarded simply to achieve a uniform approach the Greater Adelaide region. Any review of such policies must occur in conjunction with local councils.
Further reports regarding the review and DPA process will be presented to future Committee or Council meetings.

### LEGISLATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN

#### LEGISLATION
- Development Act 1993
- Development Regulations 2008
- The Barossa Council Development Plan
- South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide chapter

#### STRATEGIC PLAN
- 2.2 Business & Industry
- 3.1 Character & Heritage
- 3.5 Planning & Building

#### FINANCIAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Nil

#### COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
The Minister will be required to follow standard DPA consultation procedures during which time Council will also be invited to comment on draft policies.

### 9.2 **LYNDOCH RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT – UPDATE (B1889)**

**MOVED** Cr Milne
That the report be noted and received.

**Seconded** Cr Harms

CARRIED

#### INTRODUCTION
This report provides an update on the Lyndoch Residential Development Plan Amendment (DPA).

#### COMMENT
At its meeting on 16 December 2014 Council responded to advice from the Minister for Planning that he intended to make changes to the DPA relating to site contamination and the restriction on the type and height of dwellings. Council resolved to advise the Minister that it supported the proposed change to the Desired Character Statement to include specific reference to the fact that potentially contaminating activities have occurred on the subject land, but that it did not support proposed changes to policies to allow for two storey residential development and semi-detached dwellings to occur.

The Minister was advised of Council's decision on 18 December with his office subsequently acknowledging receipt on 24 December.

To date no further information has been received regarding how the Minister intends to proceed. A request for an update was sent to the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure on 27 February 2015. A verbal update will be provided at the Committee meeting if further information is received in the meantime.

### LEGISLATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN

#### LEGISLATION
- Development Act 1993
- Development Regulations 2008
- The Barossa Council Development Plan
- South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide chapter
This report provides a progress report on the Kalbeeba Infill Investigations study.

In November 2014 work commenced on the “Kalbeeba Infill Investigations” study, a project coming out of the Strategic Directions Report.

The first step in the project involved writing to approximately 50 property owners inviting their involvement and giving opportunity to have a personal discussion with council staff to pass on any views about the study area, any issues being experienced, and any ideas they had about future development.

During December staff met with the owners of 13 properties in the study area and one person who lives just outside the study area.

A public ‘report back’ session was originally proposed where staff would present information received from the discussions with owners, together with other observations and information relevant to the study. In lieu of the public session a summary document has been provided to all owners and others who have expressed an interest in being involved. The document includes a preliminary identification of constraints, opportunities and other observations. Feedback on the document has been invited.

The next steps in the process are:

1. Prepare and evaluate options for the study area based on the information currently available and any further information received from stakeholders
2. Present options, including a preferred option, to an Elected Member workshop
3. Prepare and present draft strategy to Strategic Planning & Development Policy Committee for endorsement for consultation
4. One month consultation with stakeholders
5. Conduct information session
6. Review submissions
7. Prepare and present final strategy to Strategic Planning & Development Policy Committee for adoption
8. Development Plan Amendment process
9. Infrastructure planning, budgeting and construction
Note: Preliminary infrastructure planning and budgeting will occur during steps 2 and 7, with formal needs identified during and after the DPA process in steps 8 and 9.

**LEGISLATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN**

**LEGISLATION**
Development Act 1993
Development Regulations 2008
The Barossa Council Development Plan
South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide chapter

**STRATEGIC PLAN**
3.1 Character & Heritage
3.5 Planning & Building

**FINANCIAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**
As indicated above infrastructure planning and budgeting is likely to take place at various steps through the process.

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**
The community is being provided with various opportunities to be involved throughout the study process and will have a formal opportunity to comment during the DPA process.

**9.4 TOWNSHIPS REVIEW PROJECT – INFORMATION REPORT (B2141)**

MOVED Cr Milne
That the report be noted and received.

Seconded Cr Miller CARRIED

**INTRODUCTION**
This report provides information on the Townships Review which is about to commence.

**COMMENT**
Council’s Strategic Directions Report 2013 (SDR) provided a five year program of policy amendments and actions to align the Development Plan with the 30-Year Plan and to respond to trends and issues identified by Council. The program included a coordinated set of further studies or projects that will examine the need for amendments to the Development Plan.

The SDR identified two projects relating to townships and an industrial area at Angaston which are interrelated:

1. A Townships Review comprising the following tasks:
   - High level strategic assessment of townships
   - Review existing planning policy and desired character statements, design policy and spatial planning aspirations
   - Identify constraints and opportunities for growth in the context of the Character Preservation District amendments to the Planning Strategy
   - Consider policies for higher density residential development in major townships, allotment size, and desired building heights across all townships, ensuring the protection of valued character elements in delivering housing growth
   - Review zoning, retail provision, road and pedestrian connections, car parking and allotment configuration
   - Will be informed by relevant outcomes pertaining to townships arising from the spatial/concept planning investigations
   - Be informed by the Tanunda Urban Design Framework and Master Plan, Nuriootpa place management project and Angaston Urban Design Framework
2. A **Spatial/concept planning project** in association with individual Development Plan Amendment projects comprising the following tasks:

- Investigations, constraints analysis and spatial planning work for:
  - selected residential and rural living precincts at Angaston, Eden Valley, Lyndoch, Williamstown and other areas
  - selected general, light and extractive industrial land at Nuriootpa and Angaston
  - other vacant or undeveloped township land
- Concept plans for development to be inserted into the Development Plan as required

As these projects are interrelated in terms of issues analysis, staff believe an opportunity exists to undertake the projects simultaneously which will provide a better outcome in a more cost-effective and timely manner. It is intended to undertake the project internally, engaging special external expertise as required.

A draft study/project brief will guide investigations and analysis. The brief is based on the intent and issues ‘endorsed’ in the SDR; however opportunity exists to include any additional issues to address.

Progress reports will be provided for council consideration regarding current issues and options before undertaking any structured consultation with the wider community.

---

**LEGALISATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN**

**LEGISLATION**
- Development Act 1993
- Development Regulations 2008
- The Barossa Council Development Plan
- South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide chapter

**STRATEGIC PLAN**
- 3.1 Character & Heritage
- 3.5 Planning & Building

---

**FINANCIAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS**

Funds for the project have been allocated in the 2014/2015 budget and appropriate funding to finalise and implement changes via a DPA will be included in the 2015/2016 budget.

---

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATION**

Opportunities for community engagement are yet to be determined; however it is envisaged that direct contact will be made with owners of ‘strategic’ properties which will be the subject of concept planning, owners of properties which might be the subject of zoning changes/corrections, and other relevant stakeholders as deemed appropriate. The broader community will have opportunity to comment during any subsequent DPA process.

---

**9.5 30-YEAR PLAN FOR GREATER ADELAIDE – UPDATE PROCESS (B139)**

**MOVED** Cr de Vries
That the report be noted and received.

**Seconded** Cr Hurn  
**CARRIED**

---

**INTRODUCTION**

The Minister for Planning has advised Council that an update of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide has commenced.
COMMENT
The Minister for Planning has written to Council to advise that the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has commenced work to update the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.

The first engagement with our Council occurred at the Council Workshop on 3 March. Further reports regarding the project will be presented to future Committee or Council meetings.

LEGISLATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN

LEGISLATION
Development Act 1993
Development Regulations 2008
The Barossa Council Development Plan
South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide chapter

STRATEGIC PLAN
2.2 Business & Industry
3.1 Character & Heritage
3.5 Planning & Building

FINANCIAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
The intent is to use existing internal resources to provide input into the project. In the event external assistance is required this will be achieved through existing budget allocations.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
The Minister will be required to consult with the broader community which is expected to occur in late 2015.

10 ITEMS FOR INFORMATION
Nil.

11 CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS
Nil.

12 OTHER BUSINESS
Nil.

13 NEXT MEETING
Tuesday, 16 June 2015 commencing at 9.30am.

14 CLOSURE OF MEETING
Mayor Sloane closed the meeting at 10.18am.

Confirmed at Strategic Planning & Development Policy Committee
16 June 2015

Date: ........................................ Chairman: .........................................................
THE BAROSSA COUNCIL

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMITTEE

15 SEPTEMBER 2015

9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

9.1 LYNDÖCH RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT - ADVICE OF APPROVAL (B1899)

INTRODUCTION

This report advises that the Lyndoch Residential Development Plan Amendment (DPA) has been approved, with changes made by the Minister for Planning.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be noted and received.

COMMENT

The Minister for Planning has approved the Development Plan Amendment with it taking effect on Thursday 13 August 2015, approximately 18 months after it was lodged for approval.

Elected Members will recall that subsequent to the Development Plan Amendment being lodged for approval, the Minister had advised Council on two occasions that while he supported the rezoning, he did propose various changes relating to site contamination, dwelling types, dwelling height and allotment sizes and widths.

Council subsequently advised the Minister that while it supported the changes relating to site contamination, it did not support his changes relating to dwellings and allotments. In addition, in June 2015, Council presented a compromise solution to the Minister which would see a ‘graduating’ interface which commences with the vegetated buffer along Gods Hill Road and the southern boundary, and extend across to the peripheral road with single storey detached dwellings on larger lots on one side facing the rural area, with smaller lots with single storey dwellings towards the centre of the development area. This compromise was reported to the Council Meeting on 16 June 2015 (refer Agenda Item 4.2.1.2).

The Minister has approved the Development Plan Amendment with all the changes he previously presented to Council including:

- Amended Desired Character statement to include specific reference to the fact that potentially contaminating activities have occurred on the subject land.
- Amended policies in the Lyndoch Residential Policy Area 12 to allow for two storey residential development and semi-detached dwellings to occur.
- Amended policies in the Lyndoch Residential Policy Area 12 to allow for allotments which are at least 500sqm and have frontage to a public road of at least 12 metres.
Copies of the Minister’s letter of approval and the approved policies and concept plan for the Lyndoch Residential Policy Area 12 are contained in Attachment 1.

The Minister did not respond to Council’s suggested alternative approach, with his only compromise being that he has now decided to not declare the rezoned area as a “full Code” area for the purpose of the Residential Development Code (ResCode). This means all future dwellings will be a merit form of development for which Council will have the discretion to approve or refuse, instead of complying development which must be approved. In addition the Minister has asked Council to review the application of ResCode within all townships located within the Barossa Valley character preservation district as part of our proposed Townships Development Plan Amendment.

The Mayor and Chief Executive Officer decided to not make a submission to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of Parliament which undertakes a ‘final check and balance’ of the Development Plan Amendment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGISLATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEGISLATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Act 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Regulations 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Barossa Council Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide chapter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Character &amp; Heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Planning &amp; Building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINANCIAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY CONSULTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each person who made submission on the draft Development Plan Amendment has been advised that the Development Plan Amendment has been approved and supplied with a copy of the policies and concept plan for the rezoned area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 August 2015

Mr Martin McCarthy
Chief Executive Officer
The Barossa Council
PO Box 867
 Nuriootpa SA 5355

Attention: Mr Paul Mickan, Principal Planner

Dear Mr McCarthy

Request to consider the Lyndoch Residential Development Plan Amendment for Approval

I refer to your letter of 1 June 2015 regarding the amendments I have proposed to the above-mentioned draft Lyndoch Residential Development Plan Amendment (DPA).

Having carefully considered your response, I have decided to approve the DPA with the following amendments:

- including a specific reference to the fact that potentially contaminating activities have occurred on the subject land; and
- amending the policies in Residential Lyndoch Policy Area 12 to allow for two storey residential development and semi-detached dwellings to occur, and the creation of allotments, which are at least 500m² and have frontage to a public road of at least 12 metres.

The amendments are considered to be consistent with the adjoining residential areas. This policy response is considered appropriate for an area of low density character particularly with the provision of the 30 metre wide vegetations buffer which provides an appropriate interface with the adjacent rural area.

I have decided not to Gazette the area as being subject to RESCODE at this point in time. I ask that Council review the application of the Code in residential areas within all townships located within the Barossa Valley Character Preservation District as part of Council’s proposed Townships DPA.

Please note that in order for the Amendment to come into effect a ‘Notice’ under section 25(17) is published in the Government Gazette.
Following the approval of this amendment, the current version of your Development Plan will be changed to incorporate the Amendment. A copy of this new version of the Development Plan will then be sent to Council.

Please contact Jeffery Sewart on 7109 7002 should you require further clarification or assistance in relation to the abovementioned matters.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

John Rau
Deputy Premier
Minister for Planning
Residential Lyndoch Policy Area 12

Refer to the Map Reference Table for a list of the maps that relate to this policy area.

OBJECTIVES

1. A policy area for low-density residential development that is sensitive to the topography of the area and which has minimal visual and environmental impacts.

2. Development that contributes to the desired character of the policy area.

DESIRED CHARACTER

The policy area comprises land on the south-western fringe of the Lyndoch township. The land is naturally undulating and includes elevated areas with distant views toward the Lyndoch Valley Road in a south-easterly direction. The land topography, open pastures, dense vegetation bordering Gods Hill Road and stands of mature trees contribute to a semi-rural character and pleasant entrance to the township.

Historically, potentially contaminating activities have occurred within the policy area including the introduction of fill and the use of the land for market gardening purposes. The possibility of onsite contamination is to be addressed as part of future land division applications.

It is expected that the area will be developed for residential purposes at low densities consistent with the maintenance of a small country township character.

The division of land will be orderly, co-ordinated and in accordance with Concept Plan Map Baro/17 – Lyndoch Fringe. Connectivity to Samuel Stephens Court should occur to ensure appropriate integration with established residential development and associated infrastructure. Allotments fronting Gilbert Street and those adjacent to Gods Hill Road and the southern boundary of the policy area should be large in size to provide a suitable transition at the interface with adjacent development. It is also important that vegetated buffers are incorporated into any residential subdivision as a means of minimising potential conflicts with primary production land or other non-residential activities.

Non-residential development should not occur within the policy area.

PRINCIPLES OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Land Use

1. The following forms of development are envisaged in the policy area:
   - carport
   - domestic outbuilding in association with a dwelling
   - dwelling
   - pergola
   - verandah.

Form and Character

2. Development should not be undertaken unless it is consistent with the desired character for the policy area.

3. Development should comprise of low density residential development.

4. Residential development should accord with Concept Plan Map Baro/17 – Lyndoch Fringe.
Dwellings should be designed and located within the following parameters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback from Gilbert Street frontage</td>
<td>9 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback from primary road frontage</td>
<td>8 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback from secondary road frontage</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback from side boundaries</td>
<td>2.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback from rear boundary</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum number of on-site car parking spaces</td>
<td>2 spaces for dwellings with up to 2 bedrooms (one of which should be covered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 spaces for dwellings with 3 or more bedrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development for non-residential purposes should not be undertaken within the policy area.

Sheds, garages and similar outbuildings should be designed and located within the following parameters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum floor area</td>
<td>100 square metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum wall height (from natural ground level)</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback from side and rear boundaries</td>
<td>0.6 metres for wall heights up to 2.7 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 metres for wall heights over 2.7 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum setback from a public road or public open</td>
<td>No closer than any building on the site, or adjacent site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appearance of Land and Buildings

The external appearance of buildings, including their form, height, bulk and materials, should not detract from the character and amenity of the locality within which they are situated.

Development should be designed to:

(a) achieve a profile that complements the natural topography of the land
(b) avoid the use of bright and highly reflective external materials and finishes
(c) minimise the amount of cutting and filling of the natural ground profile
(d) incorporate existing vegetation wherever possible and additional landscaping to assist in softening built form, driveways, roads and other infrastructure and site works.

Land Division

Allotments should be not less than 500 square metres in area, have a frontage to a public road of at least 15 metres (except for allotments fronting Gilbert Street where frontages should be at least 18 metres wide) and be suitable to facilitate a use of land that is consistent with the objectives of the policy area.

Land should only be divided based upon a coordinated and comprehensive land division plan and provided the land can be serviced by urban infrastructure at a level or capacity that is appropriate to the division.
The Barossa Council  
Zone Section  
Township Zone  
Residential Lyndoch Policy Area 12

12 Allotments and roads should be designed so that:

(a) a vegetated buffer with a minimum width of 5 metres can be established adjacent to Gods Hill Road

(b) a vegetated buffer with a minimum width of 30 metres can be established along the length of the southern zone boundary

(c) there is no direct access from or onto Gods Hill Road

(d) buildings, roads and driveways follow the natural contours of the land so as to reduce their visual impact and need for earthworks

(e) allotments adjacent to Gods Hill Road are oriented so their primary frontage addresses Gods Hill Road without providing direct vehicular access from the road

(f) allotments adjacent to the southern boundary are oriented so their primary frontage addresses the boundary

(g) a road with a minimum reserve width of 14 metres is placed parallel to Gods Hill Road and the southern boundary in addition to the buffers referred to in (a) and (b) above

(h) there is connectivity through to Samuel Stephens Court

(i) adequate open space is provided and existing stands of trees are retained.

Conservation

13 Stormwater should be managed in a manner which does not have an adverse impact on natural or existing drainage systems, prevents soil erosion or siltation, mitigates peak flows and does not result in the flooding of land.
9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

9.2 KALBEEBA INFILL INVESTIGATIONS STUDY - PROGRESS REPORT (B2522)

**INTRODUCTION**

This report provides a progress report on the Kalbeeba Infill Investigations study.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the report be noted and received.

**COMMENT**

In November 2014 work commenced on the “Kalbeeba Infill Investigations” study, a project coming out of the Strategic Directions Report. All land owners in the study area were advised by letter or email of the study in early November 2014 and invited to contact a Council officer for an individual discussion. Discussions were held with the owners of 13 properties, primarily of properties located on Calton Road, in December 2014. One person from outside the study area also contacted Council for a discussion.

A summary of information received from those discussions and related observations made by Council staff was documented and circulated to all property owners in the study area in March 2015, with an invitation to comment further. This further consultation was undertaken to check the interpretation of information received and to enable any input from those people not involved in earlier consultations.

Various options for the study area were discussed at a Council workshop on 1 July 2015, and based on the feedback received from Elected Members, an Options Paper has been prepared and sent to owners and other identified stakeholders for comment. A copy of the Options Paper forms Attachment 1.

Council will use feedback received to determine a specific option, and whether changes to existing policies are to be pursued via a Development Plan Amendment process. At this stage it is proposed to present a further report to the December meeting of the Committee.

**LEGISLATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN**

**LEGISLATION**

Development Act 1993
Development Regulations 2008
The Barossa Council Development Plan
South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide chapter
STRATEGIC PLAN
3.1 Character & Heritage
3.5 Planning & Building

FINANCIAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
Infrastructure planning and budgeting is taking place at various steps through the process; however detailed consideration will depend on which option is adopted.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION
The community is being provided with various opportunities to be involved throughout the study process and will have a formal opportunity to comment during any Development Plan Amendment process.
1. BACKGROUND

In 2007 parts of Kalbeeba and Concordia, together with land at Gawler East on the south side of Calton Road, were included in the State Government's urban boundary. Since then the Gawler East area has been rezoned and is now being developed as the “Springwood” estate.

Following the urban boundary change and the Gawler East rezoning, The Barossa Council has received numerous requests from various owners in the area to either:

- rezone their land to allow residential or rural living development
- relax existing rural living policies to facilitate smaller lots for minor infill development
- review existing rural living policies to allow smaller lots.

These requests to rezone land from Rural Living or Primary Production to a zone which allows residential development have come from owners both within and outside the urban boundary. Council’s Strategic Directions Report in 2013 reviewed these requests and included a project to explore the potential for infill development within the existing rural living area at Kalbeeba “West” and the adjoining land in the Primary Production Zone. Requests relating to land outside the urban boundary could not be progressed.

As a result, Council commenced the “Kalbeeba Infill Investigations Study” to investigate the potential for infill development within the rural living precinct (referred to as “Precinct 26 Kalbeeba West” in The Barossa Council Development Plan) but also development opportunities within the adjoining land to the east which is included in Primary Production Zone: Precinct 5 Concordia.

All land owners in the study area were advised by letter or email of the study in early November 2014 and invited to contact a Council officer for an individual discussion. Discussions were held with the owners of 13 properties, primarily of properties located on Calton Road, in December 2014. One person from outside the study area also contacted Council for a discussion.

A summary of information received from those discussions and related observations made by Council staff was documented and circulated to all property owners in the study area in March 2015, with an invitation to comment further. This consultation was undertaken to check the interpretation of information received and to enable any input from those people not involved in earlier consultations.

The consultation process has helped to identify a range of development issues and constraints. Opinions have been expressed over a range of basic options (i.e. no change, reduce minimum lot size but retain as rural living, and rezoning for residential purposes); however the level of support for different basic options could not be gauged because of the limited responses and the fact that the consultation process to that point had not been structured to measure the degree of support for different options.

1 Although the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide envisages intensification of existing rural living areas and designation of new rural living areas, the Barossa Valley (Character Preservation) Act 2012 specifically restricts land divisions for residential development within the rural areas within the district, and effectively prevents intensification of existing rural living areas outside the urban boundary and creation of new rural living areas without prior agreed legislative change.
A summary of comments received from the first round of consultation are contained in Appendix 1.

This Options Paper has been prepared to enable community comment on a range of specific options. Council will use the feedback received to determine a specific option, and whether changes to existing policies are to be implemented through a Development Plan Amendment process.
2. STUDY AREA AND LOCALITY

The study area is bounded by Sunnydale Avenue on the western boundary, the railway line on the north-eastern boundary and Calton Road on the southern boundary. The study area is divided into two distinct sub-areas:

1. The “Rural Living precinct”: the western portion which comprises the existing Rural Living Zone which has been largely developed for rural living purposes.
2. The “Primary Production precinct”: the eastern portion located in the Primary Production Zone which comprises four allotments primarily used for cropping and grazing purposes.

While each precinct can be considered separately, with the potential for different outcomes, a coordinated approach to any future development of the two precincts is desirable. The study area including existing zones is shown in Figure 1.

Land on the west side of Sunnydale Road (within Gawler East in the Town of Gawler) has been developed as a fully serviced residential estate. Its character and amenity is distinctly residential, characterised by large allotments (approximately 2,000m²), wide frontages (30 – 35 metres), kerbed bitumen roads, and generous space for ancillary buildings, trees and gardens.

Land immediately to the north of the railway line is mainly used for residential or rural living purposes, but is physically separated from the study area by the railway line. Further to the northeast, the land is used for primary production purposes.

Land opposite the Primary Production precinct (south of Calton Road and east of Balmoral Road (and referred to as Kalbeeba “East” in the Development Plan) is also zoned Rural Living and has developed along similar lines as the western portion of the study area, sharing a similar character.

Land opposite the Rural Living precinct is in the Town of Gawler and is in the process of being developed into the Springwood residential estate with small allotments. The Springwood land is generally higher than the study area and drains into the study area.
"Rural Living precinct"  
"Primary Production precinct"
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Figure 1: Study area and zonings
3. STUDY AREA OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

3.1 Allotment pattern

The Rural Living precinct has been divided into 46 lots (excluding a linear reserve adjacent to the railway line). Fourteen allotments are less than 5,000m² (the current minimum lot size for subdivision purposes). Of those lots, 11 are marginally less than the current minimum lot size (between 4,000m² and 5,000m²) and three are less than 4,000m². Of the remaining 34 lots that are greater than 5,000m², five are greater than one hectare (10,000 m²) and therefore have subdivision potential under the current planning criteria. The following lot ranges are shown graphically in Figure 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4,000m²</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000m² – less than 5,000m²</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000m² – less than 6,000m²</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000m² – to less than 1 hectare</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1 hectare</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A dwelling has been built on all of the allotments in the Rural Living precinct, and three allotments have an added ‘granny flat’ building. The approximate age of the existing housing stock is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1976 (more than 40 years)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 – 1985 (30 to 40 years)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986 – 1995 (20 to 30 years)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 – 2005 (10 to 20 years)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 – 2015 (less than 10 years)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Primary Production precinct comprises four allotments with the greater portion of land held in two allotments (18.8 ha and 7.5 ha) used for cropping and grazing purposes, one allotment of 5,805m² used for rural living purposes, and the other (313m²) owned by SA Water.

3.2 Services

WATER

The Rural Living precinct is serviced with an SA Water supply. Water is also available at the Calton Road frontage of the Primary Production precinct allotments. It is the practice of SA Water to charge an augmentation charge where additional development will require SA Water to upgrade the water supply and distribution system. The charge is determined by SA Water at the time of applying for land division and is charged to the developer.
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Figure 2: Allotment sizes
SEWER
Each dwelling in the study area is serviced with an on-site effluent disposal system (i.e. a septic tank or equivalent). Sewer or Common Waste Management System (CWMS) services\(^2\) are not available within the study area, therefore reliance on on-site effluent disposal systems will constrain future development opportunities.

Public Health regulations require new on-site effluent disposal areas to be located a minimum of 50 metres from defined watercourses; allotments also need to be large enough to provide an adequate area for on-site disposal of effluent. The minimum allotment size suitable for on-site effluent disposal is 1,200m\(^2\). This is suitable for a standard size house with ‘average’ size associated structures (e.g. sheds); however experience shows that difficulties can occur where larger houses and/or sheds are proposed or where large proportions of the allotment are paved or used for other purposes. Consequently, to enable a reasonable degree of flexibility in the development of allotments, installation of a sewer or CWMS service is recommended wherever allotments less than 2,000m\(^2\) are contemplated.

The adjoining Gawler East development is serviced with a sewer administered by SA Water, with the allotments facing Sunnydale Avenue serviced with a rear of allotment drain. There is no sewer in Sunnydale Avenue. A pump station on Calton Road to service the Springwood estate is higher than the study area and would not be suitable to service the study area. The closest location where the study area could be connected to the sewer is at the western boundary of the Wheatsheaf Inn at the northern end of Sunnydale Avenue.

A CWMS service could be installed as an alternative to a sewer system, but effluent would either have to be eventually disposed of to the SA Water system in Gawler East or pumped to a new Council operated treatment plant and other arrangements made to dispose of treated effluent. A sewer or CWMS service would remove the requirement for each allotment to dispose of effluent on-site, and would facilitate allotments less than 2,000m\(^2\) in area.

ELECTRICITY
Electricity supply is available throughout the study area with no known requirements for upgrade.

3.3 Roads and access

All of the roads in the study area are sealed. Sunnydale Avenue, Lawson Road and James Sims Court are of a general rural road standard with a sealed road pavement, graded verges and no kerb. Seventy five metres of Lawson Road (at the eastern end) is unformed and unmade, and would require construction to service any additional development to the east. Hameister Court has been constructed with roll over kerb and a turning area at the end of the no-through road.

Calton Road is also of a rural road standard. It has an 80 kph speed limit and has kerbing on a small portion of the northern side and near the entrance to the Springwood estate. Traffic islands and slip lanes have been installed for both the entrance to the Springwood estate and for the Balmoral Road intersection. The traffic islands associated with the Springwood estate entrance have created difficulties for residents in the study area opposite the entrance accessing their property. This portion of Calton Road carries an increasing local traffic load but is also a major

\(^2\) A sewer service is operated by SA Water and is designed to receive all sewerage waste directly into the drain. A CWMS service is operated by the Council and utilises a septic tank to settle out and treat the solids, with only the liquid component of sewerage overflowing into the CWMS drain.
traffic link to Williamstown and the rural areas in between. It is intended in later stages of the
development of Springwood estate to divert Calton Road and Balmoral Road traffic through that
new subdivision which will reduce traffic loads on that portion of Calton Road between Sunnydale
Avenue and Balmoral Road. The timing for this to occur is unknown and is dependent upon the
rate of development in the Springwood estate, which in turn is dependent upon market
conditions. This section of Calton Road will become a 50 kph zone at that point.

Portion of Calton Road a raised embankment which would limit safe and convenient access to
several properties adjacent to the embankment if further development is allowed.

3.4 Drainage

There are three drainage lines/watercourses within the study area, all with a general north-south
alignment, all receiving water from the southern side of Calton Road, and all discharging under or
along the railway line, or the reserve adjacent to the railway line. The drainage line, watercourses,
water bodies and wells are shown in Figure 3.

The eastern most watercourse is located opposite Lucks Road. Drainage water from Lucks Road is
piped under Calton Road and discharged into the eastern most Primary Production allotment. The
water is then carried a short distance across the rural land, and discharged under the railway line
and into a creek north of the railway line.

Another watercourse is located in approximately the centre of the larger of the two primary
production allotments and receives drainage water from the low point in Calton Road and the
Rural Living area south of Calton Road. Water is discharged under the railway line. The land on
the northern side of the railway appears to have been modified and the flow path between the
railway line and the creek is poorly defined.

A (western) drainage line and associated catchment³ in the Rural Living precinct is complex and
problematic receiving stormwater from outside and within the study area. Stormwater from the
Springwood estate drains under Calton Road and flows through several allotments northwards
where surface water is discharged onto the end of Hameister Court. Low flows are contained
within the kerb and road drainage system of Hameister Court; however the natural flow path is
located west of the road and in higher rainfall events water can overflow into the land on the
western side of Hameister Court creating a risk of flooding to the property. From Lawson Road
and the northern end of Hameister Court, a channel has been cut through the middle of three
allotments on the western side of James Sim Court. Drainage water is then dispersed onto the
reserve adjacent to the railway line to make its way to the drainage system at the northern end of
Sunnydale Avenue. There is also a swale drain between the end of James Sims Court and the
reserve to dispose of water from the road through a formal easement.

The Springwood estate has a stormwater detention system designed to detain run-off from a
larger 1-in-100-year event and to release the water at a rate equivalent to a 1-in-5-year pre-
development rainfall event. While this has addressed the risk of flooding from major storm
events, the increase in impervious area has resulted in more frequent and prolonged flows from

³ Note: The drainage line in the western portion of the Rural Living precinct is not shown as a watercourse on the State
government’s Location SA Map Viewer website (www.location.sa.gov.au/viewer) or Atlas SA website
(www.atlas.sa.gov.au) however it does fall within the definition of “watercourse” under the Natural Resources
Figure 3: Drainage

smaller events along the drainage line. This has increased the level of general nuisance as well as waterlogging of land along the drainage line where there is no channel. In this context infrastructure is required to be constructed by Lend Lease to cater for the frequent 1:2 year storm event in a piped system from Calton Road to Lawson Court, but this is not yet in place.

Future and additional development opportunities are constrained near this drainage line. Although stormwater can be piped, a land corridor would need to be found for the piped infrastructure with associated easements and it will also be necessary to retain an overland flow path for those circumstances where the capacity of a pipe is exceeded or the pipe becomes blocked. Such an overland flow path may not necessarily follow the underground pipe and could be located on private land in an associated drainage easement or within public land comprising a reserve or road. Any drainage works along the drainage line will also need to be designed and constructed in a co-ordinated manner.

There is no formal or organised drainage system to drain all allotments within the Rural Living precinct, for example there are a number of instances, particularly in the south-eastern quadrant where stormwater drains through several properties before reaching the drainage line. Individual land owners have undertaken their own work to reduce the nuisance on their own property by channelling water received from higher properties through their property to a lower property where similar action is taken. The resulting ‘system’ is informal and ad hoc, and not suitable for further development. Any further development (including the realisation of current development potential) will require this issue to be periodically addressed.

In the absence of a formal sewer or CWMS system being installed, the requirements of the On-site Wastewater Systems Code April 20134 (the Code) mean that the watercourses, drainage line and wells create a significant constraint to additional development of the allotments near these features. In particular, a “Land application system” (effluent disposal area) under the Code would be required to be a minimum of 50 metres from a watercourse, including the drainage line. Several existing allotments in the western portion are wholly within 50 metres of the drainage line and could not be further divided and subsequently developed without installation of a sewer or CWMS system to remove effluent. Other allotments in the Primary Production precinct have significant areas within 50 metres of a watercourse and therefore also have restricted development potential.

Various measures have previously been implemented or are proposed to address issues associated with the western drainage line. Completed works include installation of a ‘base’ (low) flow pipe in Hameister Court. Proposed works include a privately funded extension of the base flow pipe in Hameister Court to the south through private property towards Calton Road, and Council funded works in James Sim Court to divert the increasing frequent small flows from the nearby drainage line through to reserve adjacent the railway line. These works are designed to address existing issues by restoring equivalent flow patterns to which existed prior to the Springwood estate development commenced. However it is noted that outcomes from this infill investigations study may present opportunities for more practicable solutions. For example rather than the base flow pipe and associated overland flow path between Calton Road and Hameister Court being installed and passing through private land, it could be placed within a cul-de-sac (road) from Calton Road.

4 The On-site Wastewater Systems Code April 2013 is a code prescribed under the South Australian Public Health (Wastewater) Regulations 2013
then through a reserve connecting to Hameister Court with such outcomes being facilitated through amended policies relating to allotment size.

RAILWAY
Until recently the railway line along the north eastern boundary of the study area was used to cart limestone from Penrice to Port Adelaide. That operation has ceased but the railway line remains available for use in the future.

SHARED PATH
Council is currently finalising plans to extend the Jack Bobridge Track within its area. The intent is to install the shared path within the railway reserve from Ann Milroy Lane and then within the Council owned reserve adjacent to the railway line through to Sunnydale Avenue. The above opportunities and constraints are shown in Figure 4.
Study area boundary
Allotment boundary
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Rural living lots 1 ha and above
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5m contours
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Figure 4: Opportunities and constraints
4. OPTIONS

4.1 Introduction

This section outlines a number of options for the study area. For practical reasons a basic range of five options have been presented. Additional options or refinement of the options can be further investigated if necessary.

Options exist for both precincts but it does not necessarily imply that both precincts must be treated the same; however if different options are adopted for each precinct, potential coordination and interface issues will need to be taken into consideration.

DISCLAIMER

The plans presented with the options are intended to assist discussion by demonstrating the reasonable extent of development that could potentially be realised. The layouts are not preferred or recommended layouts for adoption by Council. The actual yield that would be achieved under each option can vary according to the planning criteria adopted, market conditions at the time of application, individual developer preferences and whether or not existing dwellings, outbuildings and other structures are demolished.

In the event of any particular option being adopted, developers or land owners will be responsible to undertake their own research and prepare their own layout designs prior to lodging any future applications for land division with Council for approval.

Similarly, costs of works associated with a number of options should only be regarded as approximate and be used for comparison purposes only. They are based on industry averages (e.g. average cost per metre of kerbing) and have not been prepared from a detailed design approach or with regard to site specific issues that may be encountered.

4.2 Options for the Rural Living precinct

Five options are presented for the Rural Living precinct shown in Figure 5, ranging from no change to the current planning criteria through to a theoretical maximum development potential if Residential Zone criteria (which apply in townships such as Angaston and Tanunda) were adopted. The potential for allotment sizes smaller than 500m², such as those in the Springwood estate have not been examined.

All options include the potential for additional battle-axe shaped allotments which are not actively supported by existing Rural Living Zone policies. Despite this two battle-axe allotments exist in Lawson Road where new dwellings have been constructed behind another dwelling. This issue is discussed in more detail in Section 4.4.

Options 1 – 4 are based on the assumption that existing dwellings will remain but that outbuildings and other structures may require removal. Options are also based on the assumption that constraints such as drainage and waste water disposal are satisfactorily addressed.
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Figure 5: Rural Living precinct
Option 1: No change

Key features
- Retains existing zoning
- Retains current minimum allotment size of 0.5 hectare (5,000m$^2$).
- Maintains existing rural living character

Development potential
- Five allotments are greater than one hectare and therefore have division potential with 11 additional allotments possible
- The majority of the development potential exists on two allotments in Calton Road but these will require either a public road to be created, or a community road in a community plan of division.
- Three allotments could be created as battle-axe shaped allotments, or alternatively by a Community Plan division.
- An indicative plan is contained in Figure 6.1

Discussion
This option proposes to retain the existing rural living amenity characterised by large allotments, large setbacks from the street, space for large trees and minimal infrastructure (e.g. rural bitumen roads with grade verges, no sewer or CWMS system, and minimal stormwater drainage works).

As indicated earlier, Council has budgeted to install a base flow pipe in James Sim Court to divert the increasing frequent small flows from the nearby drainage line. Higher irregular flows will continue to follow the existing drainage line as has happened in the past. No other expenses are envisaged with this option.

The two allotments in Calton Road with existing development potential have unmanaged drainage and/or effluent disposal issues that will need to be addressed by the owners or developers of the properties. One allotment has a drainage line that will need to be taken into account in the layout of any future design. Arrangements will also have to be made to ensure that effluent from any future houses can be disposed of 50 metres from the watercourse. The other allotment is outside the drainage line and an owner or developer will need to make suitable arrangements for the disposal of stormwater to enable further subdivision.
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Figure 6.1: Option 1 - No change
Option 2: Rural Living 3000

Key features

- Retains existing zoning
- Reduces minimum allotment size from 5,000m² to 3,000m²
- Moderately increases the development potential of the area, while retaining its rural living character.
- Basic planning criteria envisaged:
  - Minimum lot size of 3,000m²
  - Minimum frontage of 30m
  - Minimum front set-back distance for structures of 15.0m
  - Minimum side set-back distance of 5.0m
  - Rural road with graded verges (i.e. no kerb)
- No sewer or CWMS system would be required and minimal stormwater works as Option 1 would be undertaken.
- An indicative plan is contained in Figure 6.2.

Development potential

- Only 10 allotments greater than 6,000m² will have further subdivision potential resulting in an increase of approx. 26 additional allotments and an overall number of approx. 72 allotments.

Discussion

This option retains the character of the area through minimal improvements to infrastructure and introducing additional development policies aimed at retaining the open character of the area.

Existing allotments with an area less than 6,000m² would not be able to be divided under this option, and their retention would assist in retaining the existing rural living character of the area.

As with Option 1 - No Change, each land owner or developer would need to address effluent and stormwater disposal issues when application is made to divide the land.
Figure 6.2: Option 2 - Rural Living 3000
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Figure 6.2: Option 2 - Rural Living 3000
**Option 3: Rural Living 2500**

**Key features**
- Retains existing zoning
- Reduces minimum allotment size to from 5,000m² to 2,500m²
- Retains existing rural living character
- Basic planning criteria envisaged:
  - Minimum lot size of 2,500m²
  - Minimum frontage of 30m
  - Minimum front set-back distance for structures of 15.0m
  - Minimum side set-back distance of 5.0m
  - Rural road with graded verges (i.e. no kerb)

**Development potential**
- 14 allotments would have subdivision potential resulting in a potential increase of approx. 35 allotments, to give an overall total of approx. 81 allotments.
- The remaining allotments would not be able to be divided further due to size, inability to achieve a 30 metre frontage, dwelling location, site constraints or administrative difficulties in dividing community allotments
- An indicative plan is contained in Figure 6.3.

**Discussion**
This option also intends to retain a rural living character but the additional development could result in a slight dilution of the current character.

Additional development potential could be realised when the value of the existing dwellings depreciate relative to the value of the proposed allotments, to a point that demolition becomes viable.

Costs will be marginally more than Option 1 - no change. No CWMS, road works or kerbing will be required, other than ongoing maintenance, but a marginally higher capacity stormwater system may be required because of the slightly higher run-off. Each developer or landowner will be responsible to address stormwater disposal issues at the time of land division.
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Figure 6.3: Option 3 - Rural Living 2500
Option 4: Residential Large 2000

Key features
- Retains existing zoning
- Reduce minimum allotment size from 5,000 m² to 2,000m²
- Envisages transition to a residential character
- No CWMS or sewer but improve roads and other services
- Basic planning criteria envisaged:
  - Minimum lot size of 2,000m²
  - Minimum frontage of 25m
  - Minimum front set-back distance for structures of 8.0m
  - Minimum side set-back distance of 5.0m

Development potential
- 14 allotments with additional subdivision potential resulting in a potential increase of approx. 38 allotments, to give an overall total of approx. 84 allotments
- An indicative plan is contained in Figure 6.4.

Discussion
No sewer service would be required but a stormwater disposal system is expected to be necessary. Improvements to existing roads and kerbing will also be required to assist in managing increased development and traffic movements. Footpaths are not envisaged in this option.

Estimated costs are:
- Stormwater $515,000
- Kerbing $135,000
- Roads $200,000
- Earthworks $50,000
- TOTAL $900,000

This option proposes transforming the character of the area to large residential lots, similar to that in Gawler East with residential allotments sufficiently large to provide for on-site effluent disposal and space to provide for larger houses and a wider range of residential activities (larger sheds, swimming pools, tennis courts, larger gardens etc.). The attainment of a spacious residential character would be assisted by requiring wide frontages and set-back distances similar to Gawler East and further investment in infrastructure by Council to improve the roads and drainage system to a more urban standard.

Similar to previous options, some allotments would not be able to be redeveloped without demolishing the existing dwelling and there would be a longer transition time to achieve a predominantly more urban character. Some allotments close to the drainage lines will not be able to be further divided because of the inability to dispose of effluent on site. The design of the layout between Calton Road and the top of Hameister Court will require care to ensure that future development does not obstruct the overland flow path.
Figure 6.4: Option 4 - Residential Large 2000
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(Refer to disclaimer in report)
**Option 5: Residential Standard 500**

**Key features**
- Rezone from Rural Living to Residential
- Apply the current Residential Zone requirements and the minimum lot size of 500m$^2$ applicable to townships such as Angaston and Tanunda to the area.
- Assumes each existing allotment will be independently subdivided.
- Basic planning criteria envisaged:
  - Minimum lot size of 500m$^2$
  - Minimum frontage of 15m
  - Minimum front set-back distance for structures of 6.5m

**Development potential**
- Approx. 240 additional allotments could ultimately be achieved under this option.
- An indicative plan is contained in Figure 6.5.

**Discussion**
This option envisages the character of the area will change to typical residential form with associated standards for infrastructure and services. Improvements to the infrastructure will be required, with the installation of a sewer or CWMS service being critical. The resultant character of the area will be distinctly residential, more comparable with the newer areas of Tanunda than the more spacious ‘Option 4: Residential Large 2000’.

**Estimated costs are:**

- CWMS $580,000
- Stormwater $515,000
- Kerbing $135,000
- Roads $200,000
- Footpaths $150,000
- Earthworks $50,000
- **TOTAL** $1,480,000

The installation cost of the CWMS service could be recovered over a period of time through an annual service charge. The cost of upgrading street lighting has not been included.

A 500m$^2$ allotment requires installation of a sewer or CWMS service. Either the Council would be responsible for the installation of a CWMS service, or SA Water would be responsible for the installation of a sewer system to service existing allotments. Each landowner would then be responsible for connections and the cost of further extensions as they subdivide.

The significant increase in urban development will result in an increase in stormwater run-off, requiring the installation of an engineered stormwater system. Council would need to install a system to service existing allotments, with each landowner being responsible for extensions at the time of further subdivision. Additional traffic and stormwater discharge to the roads will require the existing roads to be improved to a residential standard with kerbing and footpaths.

Each landowner would be responsible for water and electricity augmentation charges at the time of redevelopment, typical for any residential development.
A requirement for a minimum frontage of 15 metres limits the number of allotments that can be achieved, and will result in many allotments being significantly greater than 500m². Some allotments will be disproportionately deep, but if this is considered to be an issue, a depth to width ratio could be considered which will have the effect of increasing the width of an allotment and decreasing the overall number of allotments that could be created. Some larger existing allotments will be suitable for development by community division. However this can only be managed at the time of concepts being prepared for actual land division.

A number of potential allotments will only be able to be realised if existing houses are demolished. This is expected to fragment and delay redevelopment, which will occur in an ad-hoc manner over a long period of time. Redevelopment is likely occur in two phases, the first involving creating vacant allotments around existing houses without any demolition, and the second (and later) phase occurring only when it is economical to demolish a dwelling to create additional allotments. The transition from predominantly rural living to predominantly residential could potentially take in excess of 20 years (given the age of existing dwelling stock).

The potential overall number of allotments may not be fully realised as it is expected that some owners will prefer to forgo the longer term (maximum) potential and only realise portion of the land potential around existing houses which are still in good condition and which prevent full realisation of maximum development potential.

This option also assumes that the further subdivision of the existing community titles will be impractical.

Over 400 allotments could potentially be realised if a coordinated layout, disregarding existing property boundaries, was implemented; however this would require a developer acquiring all or a large number of the existing properties to be able to undertake a self-coordinated development and therefore is considered unlikely.
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Figure 6.5: Option 5 - Residential Small 500
4.3 Options for the Primary Production precinct

Key features
A range of development options are available for the Primary Production precinct, including rezoning to Residential, Rural Living or Deferred Urban. A Deferred Urban zoning may be appropriate if the current Rural Living Zone is rezoned and if it is considered that the development of the Primary Production precinct should be delayed. Rezoning the area as Deferred Urban would offer protection against the establishment of land uses that would be inappropriate if the land is subsequently rezoned for urban purposes.

This precinct benefits from a number of advantages relative to the Rural Living precinct:
• Development is not inhibited by existing houses and other built assets or numerous internal property boundaries, thereby enabling greater design flexibility and maximisation of development potential.
• All internal services and roads will be at the developer’s cost and able to be fully coordinated by Council and other service providers.
• Developers will not be reliant upon either service providers or neighbouring developers to provide a service at their boundary.

Discussion
Indicative layouts have not been prepared for the Primary Production precinct options. The extent of design flexibility for the site means many options are available; however it would be appropriate to prepare basic concept plans once an option is chosen to ensure that design constraints such as the railway, pipeline, watercourses and similar matters are given appropriate consideration.

The design and building of roads and services will need to be coordinated with those required in the Rural Living Zone. There will also be some timing issues to address such as scheduling the development with improvements to Calton Road and/or Lawson Road.

4.4 General discussion

If any of the residential options for the Rural Living precinct are adopted redevelopment is likely to occur in two distinct phases. The first phase will involve creating vacant allotments where it is possible to do so without demolishing existing buildings or significant structures. The second phase will involve dividing the remaining larger allotments where demolition will be required to obtain the full development potential of the land. This phase is likely to be delayed because the increase in vacant land values that will be required to justify demolishing a house is unlikely to occur until the continuing supply of vacant allotments from Springwood and other nearby areas is exhausted. This second phase may take 20 to 30 years to achieve.

A similar effect is likely to occur with the rural living options. The first phase involving creating additional allotments that do not involve demolition will occur relatively quickly because of the higher value of the resulting vacant lots. The second phase, involving demolition of dwellings to be able to subdivide is also likely to occur more quickly than the residential options because the increase in vacant land values (for rural living lots) is likely to be attractive due to a limited supply of rural living allotments.
The no-change option will obviously limit further land division but it would not prevent future redevelopment entirely. It is reasonable to expect that over time, as rural living allotments appreciate in value, those allotments with older, lower value housing stock will become under-capitalised and become sought after for redevelopment with higher value housing stock. This renewal process will also occur over a long time span.

It is possible that the market may perceive 2,500m² or 3,000m² rural living allotments as large higher value residential allotments, which in turn may create lobbying pressures on Council in the future to provide residential standards of services (e.g. kerbs, footpaths and street lighting). Therefore costing an option of 2,500m² allotments with a residential character instead of a rural living character may be necessary.

The nature of the character of an area also requires careful consideration as it will influence a range of planning criteria for the area and the extent of public infrastructure investment. The nature of the character of an area is influenced by a number of factors including:

- Allotment size
- Allotment shape – e.g. standard rectangular or battle-axe
- Allotment widths
- Front set-back distances
- Side set-back distances
- Nature of road construction (i.e. sealed or unsealed, kerbed or graded verges)
- Street landscaping
- Private landscaping and sizes of gardens
- Land use
- Style and design of buildings.

For example, rural living areas are generally characterised by rural standard roads, larger allotments, larger set-back distances, larger spaces between houses, open style fences, and a greater range of ancillary activities such as low impact livestock keeping, and larger sheds; whereas residential areas are characterised by residential streets with kerbing, smaller allotments, reduced set-backs, closer spacing of dwellings, and solid forms of fencing.

Allowance for battle-axe shaped lots in the study area also requires consideration. Current Development Plan provisions do not support such allotments in the Rural Living Zone; however some battle-axe shaped allotments can improve utilisation of land and can be used to create allotments around existing houses to avoid the need to demolish a dwelling. In denser developments because of additional and narrow driveway entrances, reduced areas of front yard landscaping, and additional solid side fencing, battle-axe lots can impact on character. As a number of battle-axe shaped allotments exist in Lawson Road additional allotments of this nature might not necessarily be out of character in that location, provided they are large enough and suitably located.
5. **HAVE YOUR SAY**

Council invites comments on the options in this paper. Council is particularly interested to know:

- Is any particular option favoured over others?
- Are any options more realistic or practical in Kalbeeba than others?
- Are there other options which Council should consider?
- Should battle-axe lots be supported in certain areas?

Please provide comments before **Friday 2 October 2015** by either:

- email: barossa@barossa.sa.gov.au
- post: PO Box 867, Nuriootpa, SA, 5355

Council will consider all comments prior to deciding on a preferred option or combination of options.

For more information please contact Paul Mickan, Principal Planner on 8563 8444.
APPENDIX 1.  SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING CONSULTATION TO DATE
KALBEEBA INFILL INVESTIGATIONS STUDY

Summary of comments received from first round of consultation held in December 2014

BACKGROUND

The Council has commenced the “Kalbeeba Infill Investigations” study to investigate the potential for infill development within parts of the Rural Living Zone and the Primary Production Zone bounded by Sunnydale Avenue, Calton Road, and the railway line.

The study is currently involved in an information gathering and community consultation process to identify ideas, constraints, opinions, options and the like. (Any subsequent policy changes identified by the study will need to be implemented through an additional, separate formal Development Plan Amendment Process.)

The study area is divided into two distinct sub-areas. The western portion is comprised of the existing Rural Living Zone. A small number of allotments in this area have the potential to be divided further under existing development policies. The eastern portion of the area is located in the Primary Production Zone and comprises three allotments (excluding a small lot owned by SA Water Corporation).

All land owners in the study area were advised of the study in early November and invited to contact a Council officer for a one-on-one discussion. Discussions have been held with the owners of 13 properties, primarily of properties located on Calton Road. One person from outside the study area also contacted Council for a discussion. The following notes represent a summary of information received from those discussions and observations by Council staff.

COMMENTS, OPINIONS AND IDEAS EXPRESSED

RESIDENTIAL ZONING

- Most participants did not support the rezoning of the Rural Living Zone to Residential, citing the development on the southern side of Calton Road as being undesirable. They would not like neighbours that close if they subdivided their land.
- Most also recognised the difficulties of coordinating the redevelopment of the area for residential purposes and the cost of retrofitting and/or upgrading urban services.
- Several people gave limited support for rezoning, indicating that:-
  - lot sizes should be left to market forces to determine,
  - bushfire risk may be reduced,
  - gas is available along Calton Road
  - Kalbeeba West is functionally part of Gawler and standardisation with Gawler East is appropriate.
- A concern was expressed that rezoning or use of land generally at greater densities of development may impact on those who choose not to exploit any additional development potential. Land use conflicts may occur between those who retain a rural living use and those who occupy smaller allotments in regard to activities such as horse keeping, burning and similar activities usually tolerated on larger lots.
REDUCING THE SIZE OF RURAL LIVING LOTS

- Most of the participants that did not support rezoning land to residential were generally supportive of reducing the allotment size of rural living lots.
- No consistent revised minimum lot size was offered, but most recognised it would need to be set at a size that does not require expensive retrofitting of services, particularly sewer services, and also a size that retained the rural living character. Reasons for supporting smaller lot sizes included:-
  - Difficulty of maintaining a large allotment, particularly as owners age.
  - Being able to remain in their existing home, whilst disposing of surplus land (by those who intend to remain in the area).
  - Maximising financial advantage by subdivision (by those who intend to move).
- Those owners who specifically opposed reducing the minimum lot size, argued that:-
  - They and everyone in the zone, had bought into the zone knowing the current rules.
  - They had bought into the area because of the desire to have a large allotment and space between neighbours and its consequential advantages.
  - Those who no longer wish to enjoy their large allotment have an option of selling and moving, and it would be unjust on those who wish to retain the current character and advantages of the current lots sizes if smaller lots were allowed.

STORMWATER

- Inadequate stormwater drainage was cited by the majority of participants, but accepted that in most instances the existing allotments are large enough to enable people to informally deal with stormwater disposal issues.
- Existing issues include:-
  - Water now regularly flows from the Springwood development through a number of properties where it didn’t previously and is beginning to carve a channel. An opinion was expressed that this water should be piped through the area to minimise damage and disruption to existing activities.
  - There is inadequate provision to convey water further downstream.
  - Instances of existing natural run-off from higher elevated properties creating a nuisance as it passes through lower properties. A formal drainage system will be required with any further subdivision of this land.
  - Roadside drainage is piecemeal; verges wash and Calton Road water is directed into private properties.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

- Most participants who access Calton Road expressed concerns about the traffic on Calton Road.
- Current issues include:-
  - Speeding traffic with a suggestion that the speed limit should be reduced
  - Sight distances to the east along Calton Road are inadequate for traffic exiting Balmoral Road.
  - Cars are observed to brake heavily regularly to turn right into Balmoral Road from Calton Road.
  - The Sunnydale Ave/Calton Rd intersection has had a number of accidents.
  - Exiting some properties is awkward and/or unsafe on account of traffic speeds and limited site distances caused by dips or crests in the road. The traffic islands in Calton Road at the entrance to the Springwood Estate create an awkward situation for people exiting the community scheme at 118/120 Calton Road, and other nearby properties.
  - The existing Springwood Estate entrance may become the main entrance as the development expands.
- Lawson Road is not of an adequate standard to become a through road to service any future development of that portion of the Primary Production Zone to the east.
• The cycle path finishes at the railway crossing at the eastern end of the study area. Cyclists are then forced to use Calton Road which is of inadequate width to safely accommodate cyclists and traffic. The cycle path should be extended into Gawler as a separated path.

PRIMARY PRODUCTION AREA
• Most participants who lived in the Rural Living Zone were indifferent to potential changes to the Primary Production Zone, with most accepting of the idea of rezoning the land to be compatible with whatever happens in the existing Rural Living Zone.
• Several people either opposed the rezoning of the Primary Production Zone, or suggested that it should be deferred until the traffic management issues on Calton Road were fixed. The development of the Primary Production Zone was seen to aggravate the existing problems.
• The land is isolated from other primary production land which makes it difficult to farm with other land holdings. There are difficulties in attracting share farmers because of the relatively small size of the farm allotments and its isolation from other rural land holdings.
• A view was put that the land was easier and more economically viable to divide for residential purposes than the Rural Living Zone and should not be held back because of the constraints inhibiting the Rural Living Zone. Allotment sizes approximating a quarter of an acre was suggested to provide diversity in lots sizes available in the locality - ie somewhere between the small residential lot sizes in Springwood Estate and the half hectare lots in the Rural Living Zone, but not so small so as to be out of character with the adjacent rural living areas.
• The difficulties of redeveloping a rural living area as a residential area in the future is evident from review of the current Rural Living Zone, and therefore it would be desirable to avoid this issue in the future by rezoning the primary production area as residential.
• Parks or small reserves may be possible along the watercourses in the zone, and along the railway line if further subdivision was allowed.
• The above ground pipeline on the northern side of Calton Road restricts access points to some of the land.

OTHER MATTERS
• Consideration should be given to consulting land owners on the southern side of Calton Road if the Primary Production Zone land is to be re-zoned as they will be affected.
• Inconveniences associated with development could drag out for years if redevelopment drags on for years in a piecemeal manner.
• Improving the roads with kerb and gutter, drainage, lighting etc will raise the ‘tone’ of the area.
• Rezoning or reducing the minimum lot size will increase land values which in turn will cause rates and taxes to raise, which may force asset rich/cash poor owners to sell.

CONSTRAINTS, OPPORTUNITIES AND OTHER OBSERVATIONS

A number of basic options are apparent for consideration for the existing rural living area. These basic options are not exhaustive, but include:-

1. Do nothing - make no changes to the current minimum lot size and retain the existing development potential of the area. (There is potential for up to 11 additional lots to be created from existing lots that are currently greater than 1 hectare in size.)
2. Reduce the minimum lot size for the rural living area. This would retain the existing level of servicing (ie no sewer) and would require allotment sizes larger than those in a residential area to retain a rural living character.
3. Rezone the area for a coordinated residential development with the full range of services (ie sewer and stormwater disposal.) This would involve a comprehensive concept layout plan for future land division to achieve orderly development.

A similar range of options could also be considered for the primary production area.
Consideration can be given to applying different options to the two sub-areas. For example the existing primary production area could be rezoned for residential allotments whilst retaining rural living allotments in the Rural Living Zone, so as to create a variety of allotments sizes in the locality ranging from small and medium lots in Springwood Estate and Gawler East, through to large residential and small rural living lots in Kalbeeba West

DEVELOPMENT CONSTRAINTS
There are a number of factors limiting the creation of additional development potential, and it is recognised that some existing parcels of land may not be suitable for further division. These limiting factors include:-
- **Effluent Disposal**
  The drainage line near James Sim Court and Hameister Court, running back to Calton Road will limit the ability to dispose of effluent on site. In the absence of a sewer system it will be necessary to demonstrate that each allotment in a plan of division can dispose of effluent in accordance with legislative requirements, and in particular, has a suitable area of land available for on-site effluent disposal that is a minimum of 50 metres from that drainage line.
- **Stormwater Disposal**
  The existing stormwater system is not suited to serve any increase in development potential. In the absence of the installation of a comprehensive stormwater collection system, it will be necessary to demonstrate that both effluent and stormwater can be disposed of on-site.
- **Existing buildings and assets**
  The location of existing dwellings and other high value building assets will limit the development potential of some allotments. The extent that this issue will have an effect will be dependent upon the minimum lot size and frontage chosen, building envelope criteria and whether ‘battleaxe’ shaped allotments will be entertained.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS
- The relative value of rural living allotments can be expected to increase in the future. The scope to create additional rural living allotments is also limited. A significant number of existing allotments appear to be undercapitalised. Existing housing stock in the rural living area can be expected to be slowly replaced with higher value housing stock (as the existing houses age and reduce in value) if the area is retained as a rural living area.
- Most people who made comments did not believe that redeveloping the rural living area into a residential area in a comprehensive and co-ordinated manner would viable in the current market or the foreseeable future.
- Reducing the minimum lot size in the Rural Living Zone may make any subsequent rezoning and development for residential purposes more difficult to achieve in an orderly manner. Additional dwellings and further fragmentation of the land (resulting from reduced rural living lot size) will reduce opportunities for later subdivision for residential purposes, limit options for the installation of services, and increase costs if buildings need to be removed to achieve efficient development.
- Traffic management issues will need to be addressed in any development proposals utilising Calton Road.
- The ‘do nothing’ option does not prevent Council reviewing the situation in the future when economic conditions may be more conducive to consideration of a wider range of redevelopment options.
- Roads, footpaths, kerbing and other Council assets in the area will require improvement over time regardless of what changes are made to the area’s future development potential. However, whilst increasing the development potential of the area may require a more accelerated asset improvement programme, it may also provide an opportunity to undertake those improvements in a more cost effective and co-ordinated manner.
- The larger size of the existing parcels of land in the primary production area does allow greater flexibility in developing that area.
• The future of the railway line is unknown, but is expected to remain a barrier to access the Barossa Valley Way.
• Allotment size is only one factor that influences the character of the area. Equally important are the width of allotments, their shape (eg ‘battle-axe shaped lots), set-back distances as well as a range of design criteria.
9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

9.3 STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS REPORT IMPLEMENTATION AND OTHER PROJECTS - UPDATE REPORT (B2141)

INTRODUCTION
This report provides an update on the work program arising from the Strategic Directions Report and other projects.

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received.

COMMENT
At its meeting on 6 March 2014 the Committee received an update report on the Strategic Directions Report (SDR) and a proposed implementation schedule for the various preliminary strategic investigations, Development Plan Amendments, and other projects and actions arising from the SDR.

Good progress has been made on several key projects over the past 18 months, however some delays have resulted due to the need to respond to external demands such as the 30-Year Plan Update, Concordia development concepts, and consultations associated with the Planning Reforms. Accordingly it will be necessary to adjust a number of timeframes for a number of SDR projects and other projects and actions. The current status of each project with recommended revised targets are listed for discussion in the update contained in Attachment 1.

LEGISLATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN

LEGISLATION
Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012
Development Act 1993
Development Regulations 2008
The Barossa Council Development Plan
South Australian Planning Strategy, 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide Chapter

STRATEGIC PLAN
3.1 Character & Heritage
3.5 Planning & Building

FINANCIAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS
The intent is to use in-house resources as much as possible; however it may be necessary to engage consultants using budgeted resources at various stages where the skill and experience is not available in-house.
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Formal and informal community and stakeholder consultation will take place at various stages during each strategic investigation and Development Plan Amendment project.
## STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS REPORT PROJECTS AND OTHER DEVELOPMENT POLICY PROJECTS UPDATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and other action</th>
<th>Original target (as per SDR)</th>
<th>Action taken/current status</th>
<th>Revised target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High priority projects and other actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Yet to commence</td>
<td>TBA by State Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalbeeiba Infill Investigations</td>
<td>No specific target date, dependent on Concordia structure plan</td>
<td>- Initial consultation with land owners November 2014&lt;br&gt;- Follow up consultation March 2015&lt;br&gt;- Options Paper released for community comment on 1 September 2015</td>
<td>Report on community feedback to SPDPC December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalbeeiba Infill DPA</td>
<td>When Concordia structure planning completed</td>
<td>Yet to commence. The extent of any policy changes will depend on which option is adopted by Council and State government direction for Concordia structure planning</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Areas and Character Review</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Rural Areas and Character Review completed and directions adopted by Council on 8 September 2014</td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Areas DPA</td>
<td>2014 or as otherwise agreed</td>
<td>Single DPA approach adopted on 8 September 2014&lt;br&gt;Rural Areas and Character DPA Statement of Intent agreed to by Minister for Planning on 28 July 2015&lt;br&gt;DPA investigations underway</td>
<td>Directions 'review' workshop October 2015; Draft DPA to Council or SPDPC November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character DPA</td>
<td>2014 or as otherwise agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Management and Miscellaneous strategic investigation</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Ongoing collation of issues to address&lt;br&gt;No formal strategic investigation has commenced</td>
<td>Mid 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous DPA</td>
<td>2014 or as otherwise agreed</td>
<td>Yet to commence</td>
<td>When strategic investigations are completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships Review</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Study/project brief presented to SPDPC March 2015 advising spatial/concept planning and Townships Review to be combined</td>
<td>Late 2015/early 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial/concept planning</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project and other action</td>
<td>Original target (as per SDR)</td>
<td>Action taken/current status</td>
<td>Revised target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townships DPA</td>
<td>2014 or as otherwise agreed</td>
<td>• Yet to commence</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower priority/longer term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards review</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>• Yet to commence</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards DPA</td>
<td>2016 or as otherwise agreed</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>2016/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage review</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Review DPA</td>
<td>2017 or as otherwise agreed</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism strategic investigations</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism DPA</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>2017/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other projects and other actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request State Government to remove our Council and the Barossa Valley character preservation district from the Residential Development Code provisions contained within the Development Regulations 2008.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>• This was raised indirectly in our response to the Minister for Planning’s changes to the Lyndoch Residential DPA which led to a request for Council to review the application of ResCode within all townships located within the Barossa Valley character preservation district as part of the proposed Townships DPA</td>
<td>Will be incorporated in Townships Review and DPA in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request State Government to refine and adopt the land use definitions contained in the National Tourism Planning Guide and that these definitions are inserted into the Development Regulations to guide tourism development across the State.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>• In March 2014 this was brought to the attention of South Australia’s Expert Panel on Planning Reform</td>
<td><strong>COMPLETED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider costs and benefits associated with establishing a car-park fund, including a review of the supply and demand of car-parking within the townships to determine whether or not a car-park fund may be justified.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>• Yet to commence</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare guidelines regarding privacy, amenity and parking for ‘shop top’ housing.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>• Yet to commence</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate potential for “Design Charter” or “Code” to guide good development outcomes, in particular, within sensitive and valued landscapes.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>• Yet to commence</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The suggested approach would also involve establishing a Design Advisory Group and/or Design Advisor to have early input into preparation of design based planning policy (i.e. as part of Development Plan Amendments) and potential early...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and other action</th>
<th>Original target (as per SDR)</th>
<th>Action taken/current status</th>
<th>Revised target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request State government to amend regulations and/or legislation to better define renewable energy facilities and to introduce appropriate public notification criteria. In collaboration with relevant State government agencies investigate potential revised policies for renewable energy facilities including policies that distinguish between rural and urban environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>In March 2014 this was brought to the attention of South Australia’s Expert Panel on Planning Reform</em></td>
<td>COMPLETED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>input into development proposals. Investigations will include exploration of other successful implementation models taking into account costs, efficiency and demand. Potential to incorporate policies into the Development Plan will also be explored</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. ITEMS FOR DECISION

9.4 RURAL AREAS AND CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT - STATEMENT OF INTENT AND PROJECT UPDATE REPORT (B3283)

INTRODUCTION

This report provides an update on the Rural Areas and Character Development Plan Amendment (DPA).

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received.

COMMENT

At a special meeting on 10 September 2014 Council endorsed various recommended options and directions arising from the Rural Areas and Character Review together with an associated Statement of Intent (SOI) for the subsequent Rural Areas and Character Development Plan Amendment. Council also authorised the Senior Manager, Planning Services to make any necessary minor amendments to the Statement of Intent as directed by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure staff or the Minister for Planning. A copy of the Rural Areas and Character Review Executive Summary is contained in Attachment 1.

The Statement of Intent was submitted to the Minister on 25 September 2014. In January 2015 DPTI staff raised a number of concerns with the Statement of Intent in particular:

- The relationship between the proposed Development Plan Amendment investigations and the character preservation legislation, subsequent Planning Strategy Addendum and the five character values identified in the legislation was not strongly demonstrated
- The Development Plan Amendment needs to ensure key areas of primary production (identified and mapped in PIRSA’s Priority Primary Production Areas project) are appropriately protected with a suitable suite of development policies
- The Statement of Intent contained significant policy positions that are not appropriate for inclusion as they are predetermining the outcome of the Development Plan Amendment prior to the investigations being undertaken
- In light of ongoing discussions between the Department, other Councils and government agencies on rural policy issues, a request that Council amend the Statement of Intent to reflect that the Development Plan Amendment will follow Process B1 (consultation approval required). This was to ensure that the Development Plan Amendment for consultation is consistent with the other Development Plan Amendments being undertaken and in line with the investigations being undertaken across the region.
Following various negotiations with DPTI a formal response to the above issues was provided to the Minister on 25 May 2015, together with an amended Statement of Intent. A copy of the response is contained in Attachment 2.

On 28 July 2015 the Minister agreed that the Statement of Intent forms an appropriate basis for the preparation of the Development Plan Amendment. A copy of the agreed Statement of Intent and the Minister’s accompanying letter are contained in Attachment 3.

A work program has been prepared to reflect the timeframe within the Statement of Intent. As indicated in the work program contained in Attachment 4, a draft Development Plan Amendment is to be submitted to the Minister by 17 November 2015 which coincides with a normal Council meeting. In the meantime a special Elected Member workshop will be held to ‘inform and refresh’ Elected Members of the rationale behind the endorsed policy directions. This workshop will also provide an opportunity to discuss any policy directions which may require review – eg proposed directions for interface and buffer management in light of work currently being undertaken by PIRSA, DPTI and the LGA.

### LEGISLATION/POLICY/COUNCIL STRATEGIC PLAN

**LEGISLATION**
- Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012
- Development Act 1993
- Development Regulations 2008
- The Barossa Council Development Plan
- South Australian Planning Strategy, 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide Chapter

**STRATEGIC PLAN**
- 3.1 Character & Heritage
- 3.5 Planning & Building

### FINANCIAL AND RISK MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

The intent is to use in-house resources as much as possible; however it will be necessary to engage consultants using budgeted resources at various stages where the skill and experience is not available in-house – eg mapping.

### COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

Formal community consultation on the draft Development Plan Amendment will take place in accordance with statutory requirements supplemented by non-statutory information sessions and communications.
The Barossa Council

Rural Areas and Character Review
Executive Summary
September 2014
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1. Purpose of the review

The Barossa Council has been the focus of significant strategic and policy review in recent years culminating with the State Government preparing the **Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012**, associated Ministerial Development Plan Amendments (DPAs) and recent addendum to the South Australian Planning Strategy.

The **Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012** which commenced on 18 January 2013 established the Barossa Valley District to ensure the special character of the district is recognised, protected and enhanced whilst providing for the economic, physical and social wellbeing of the community. It prevents land division for new residential development in the rural areas and protects the district from urban sprawl to Adelaide’s north.

The preservation law required the Minister for Planning (the Minister) to make any necessary related amendments to the South Australian Planning Strategy (the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide volume in this region). This process was completed through the “**Addendum to two volumes of the South Australian Planning Strategy (The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and Murray and Mallee Region Plan: Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale Character Preservation**” which was gazetted on 13 February 2014. The Barossa Council and its community were active participants in providing input into the preparation of the Planning Strategy Addendum by providing input to the ‘character values’ underpinning the amendments.

The transitional arrangements set out in the preservation law also require the Minister to ensure that The Barossa Council Development Plan be reviewed within 6 months of the release of the amendments to the Planning Strategy, so as to determine whether any amendments are needed to align with either the Planning Strategy and/or the operation and effect of the character preservation law.

In this context, the Council has completed its Strategic Directions Report 2013 (SDR) which prioritises a range of potential policy amendments to be undertaken by Council during the next five years. This responds to both the Character Preservation legislation and the Planning Strategy Addendum.

The SDR identified a priority need to commence a Rural Areas and Character Review (the Review) with associated planning policy amendments that seek to resolve key rural and character policy issues; consistent with the Character Preservation Act and Development Act requirements. The Review is intended to be a comprehensive review that would form the basis of investigations for a future Development Plan Amendment.

2. The scope and approach of the review

The Review was prepared as part of a staged approach:

- **Stage 1** – Prepare Issues Paper
- **Stage 2** – Develop policy options and engage stakeholders to review
- **Stage 3** – Prepare DPA(s) documents and undertake formal consultation

The broad format of the Review is shown on the flowchart below.
The Review will ensure that Council is conversant with both its own and the Barossa community’s aspirations for future policy direction. A comprehensive Engagement Plan has been conducted as part of the Review to assist with this process.

The SDR identified that the review will “examine the suitability of the existing rural zones and precincts. This is intended to be a comprehensive review that will investigate potential policy changes relating to a diversity of rural issues – dwellings, horticulture, ancillary development, Primary Production Priority Areas mapping, employment uses, restricted activities and effectiveness and suitability of existing buffer and interface policies.”

The scope of issues to be covered by the Review has been refined through research, and discussions with elected members, State Government and the Barossa community. In following the approach set out above, the Review includes consideration of issues grouped under the following key themes:

- Landscape character
- Design and siting of new buildings
- Interface and buffer management
- Primary production and value-adding
- Wineries and related development
- Dwellings in rural areas
- Land division, new lots and boundary realignment
3. Landscape Character

Overview:

The quality of the Barossa landscape is an important and essential factor in the area’s high quality living and working environment. It is also a valued and an essential element in attracting visitors to the region. The landscape has been modified both by the original custodians of the land (the Peramangk and Njaduri people) and heavily since European settlement.

The Barossa Council comprises a range of diverse settings from the heavily wooded areas in Flaxman Valley, to the open cropping lands at Moculta and the mixed native and European tree lined roads in the Valley Floor. The seasonal planting and growth of crops and vines add a unique layer of change to the landscape. The recent Planning Strategy Addendum recognises the scenic diversity within the Barossa region and refers to separately identifiable landscape units. These are the Barossa Range, Eastern Barossa, Barossa Valley Floor, Western Barossa and Watershed. The document does not seek to elevate one area above another in terms of scenic quality but recognises they are distinct.

A 2012 Landscape Study Implementation Scoping review identified that the current Development Plan provides a good basis for landscape assessment, however additional policy review and amendment is needed to refine existing policy. The Planning Strategy Addendum also establishes a set of new policies with a strong focus on broadly protecting and enhancing the landscape character across the Council which will be integrated into Development Plan policies, where necessary.

For example, the Barossa Range is a highly scenic natural backdrop to the Barossa Valley Floor where urban development has potential to create a marked visual impact. A review of current Development Plan policies is therefore essential to ensure that protection and enhancement of this part of the landscape continues. This includes a review of current zone boundaries and policies to protect and enhance the existing open rural and hills face landscape character.

There are currently four Conservation Parks (Hale, Sandy Creek, Kaiserstuhl and Warren) and one Recreation Park (Para Wirra) that are located within the rural zones. Conservation Parks in particular are special environments that should be protected along with careful use of immediately adjoining land.

The feedback from consultation was generally supportive of policies to encourage planting of indigenous species as part of new development. There was also general support for the proposition that planning policy should identify and reflect different areas of landscape quality. A number of submissions recognised that the character of the Barossa landscape includes economic activities which should remain part of the district.

The recommend policy options focus on updating the general section of the Development Plan to encourage the use of native species and the creation of landscaped buffers. It also recommends strengthening the provisions of the Rural Landscape Protection Zone to reinforce the preservation of areas of important scenic quality.

Recommended approach

1. Retain and enhance the quality of the Rural Landscape Protection Zone within the part of the Council formed by the Barossa Range
2. Review the Desired Character Statement and Zone Objectives and Principles of Development Control of the Rural Landscape Protection Zone to incorporate:
   - Protection the Barossa Ranges as a natural backdrop setting and contrast to the Barossa Valley Floor
   - Greater emphasis on appearance of buildings in the landscape through more specific control of external colours and materials, building height and massing, fencing and driveways
   - Consistent non-complying clauses for dwellings (with the Primary Production Zone).

3. Review the boundary of the Rural Landscape Protection Zone to ensure it adequately covers the western escarpment of the Barossa Ranges from near Williamstown to near Stockwell.

4. Review the Desired Character Statements of each rural zone to consistently reinforce the need to protect:
   - natural and rural character and scenic features
   - areas of recognised biodiversity and conservation value including areas of intact native vegetation
   - views from designated tourist routes from inappropriate built development

   Associated supporting amendments to other Development Plan policies relating to the siting, appearance and design of buildings will also address the visual impact of new built development on the landscape.

5. Review the General Section policies in order to:
   - ensure sufficient emphasis is given to utilising indigenous species and revegetation/rehabilitation, where appropriate (with inclusion of preferred species list as recommended by local NRM Boards)
   - require Landscaping and Landscape Management Plans as part of a development application
   - ensure landscape buffers are planted adjacent to Conservation Parks or areas of high biodiversity value.

6. Consider identification of panoramic views from lookouts (identified in the Planning Strategy Addendum) and inclusion of policies to protect these from intrusive development that would adversely impact enjoyment of views (focussing on the ‘fore’ views incorporating land within close proximity to the primary viewpoint).

7. Include land within the Kaiserstuhl, Hale, Sandy Creek and Warren Conservation Parks and Para Wirra Recreation Park in the Conservation Zone.
4. Design and Siting of New buildings

Overview:

The design and appearance of its buildings contributes to the character of the Barossa. Maintaining this character is important for the liveability of the area and its ability to grow by attracting residents, business and investment.

Development Plan policies to manage the siting and design of new dwellings and other buildings are considered insufficient in their current form. At present there are inconsistent policies across the rural zones and they provide limited design guidance particularly for farm buildings. Consequently, current policies have the potential to lead to poor visual outcomes which may erode the character of the district over time.

The Review considered how the Development Plan can be updated to provide better guidance for the scale, bulk, setback and screening of new development in prominent locations and better address issues such as ‘sky-lining’ which have poor visual impact on surrounding environments. The review also considered whether additional controls should be required for development on sloping land and whether the same design standards should apply to farm buildings as new dwellings. A further question was how Development Plan policy be more consistently interpreted, given the subjective nature of design and appearance.

The feedback from consultation indicated broad agreement that new buildings should make a positive or neutral visual impact on the Barossa landscape. The majority of respondents also agreed with the proposition that there should be consistent siting and design criteria for new dwellings across all rural zones. A number of respondents held the view that the design of new buildings should assessed in the context of their location and surroundings. One respondent felt that Desired Character Statements should promote a ‘Barossa building design style’.

There were differences of opinion however in relation to farm buildings, particularly sheds. A small number of respondents felt stronger criteria would be detrimental to farming interests.

Recommended approach

1. Amend policies in the General Section to more clearly reflect the values and policies contained in the Barossa Character Values addendum to the 30 Year Plan. This includes the Design and Appearance, Land Division, Siting and Visibility and Residential Development modules. Policies should be improved with a focus on the visual impact of development within the region. This may include the use of diagrams to articulate design intent.

2. Introduce more specific siting and design policies for buildings in all rural zones to update the Desired Character Statements to reflect the policies of the Barossa Character Preservation addendum to the 30 Year Plan and to update the PDCs to introduce more detailed and consistent size, siting and design requirements using the existing Primary Production Zone policies as a starting point.

3. Review existing non-complying criteria for dwellings in the Primary Production Zone to focus on achieving good design outcomes such as building height and earthworks, with criteria such as window size, orientation, and roof pitch being addressed by design policies rather than non-complying triggers.
4. Ensure the siting and design criteria for new dwellings are consistent across all rural zones by extending the amended Primary Production Zone policies to the other zones.

5. Introduce new siting and design criteria for farm and horticultural buildings across all four zones. This may include applying different policies within each zone or area, for different land uses or within a prescribed distance of a public road depending on the landscape.

6. Introduce more prescriptive criteria for new dwellings and associated private open space areas including any swimming pool to be located within a strategic building envelope that is positioned near the corner of a property and at least 40 metres from a boundary to any adjoining primary production activity.

7. Further consideration be given to the development of a Barossa ‘design code’ that can be used as a guide to the character of the area and give a clear direction about the types of outcomes sought from development. Such a guide would be a ‘user-friendly’ way of explaining its objectives and policies in relation to building siting and design, for example to guide the assessment of applications for new dwellings or farm buildings, but would not supplant the role or status of Development Plan policies.

8. Separate consideration to be given to the use of a ‘design review panel’ to assist in the design and assessment of development applications as part of a code approach to development.
5. Interface and Buffer Management

Overview:

As noted in the paper titled ‘Planning for the Future of Primary Industry in South Australia’ (2012), ambitious targets are in place in the South Australian Strategic Plan and supported by the South Australian Food Strategy to grow food, wine and fibre production and export.

At the same time, there is an increasing desire to balance the traditional primary production priorities that have historically defined rural areas with the needs and aspirations of diverse rural communities which include businesses, residents and tourists.

Having regard to these priorities, the management of primary industry interfaces both with non-primary industry land uses and between primary industries is an ongoing challenge.

The SA Select Committee on Sustainable Farming Practices (Nov 2013) has considered a number of previously identified challenges facing primary industries in SA including interface issues. With respect to the land use planning category of the Select Committee report, the Committee recommended that “procedures to manage borders between land uses ("buffer zones") be included in Development Plans, with the default position being that new development adjacent to primary production activity is required to provide a buffer zone if a zone is needed.”

The following documents were reviewed to assist in formulating a Development Plan approach to primary production interface policies:

- Victorian Department of Environment and Primary Industries; Spraying, spray drift and off-target damage (2014).
- Australian Government Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals Code Act 1994
- EPA Guidelines for Separation Distances (December 2007).
- District Council of Mt Barker, Rural (Primary Production) DPA (12 May 2014).
- Preliminary Discussion / Research with Stakeholders.

The community consultation process response to the need for buffer policies being embedded in Development Plans raised two main views:

- If there is a need for rural to rural interface given that “many farmers can work well together in harmony with each other” and that there are chemical use obligations on farmers;
- Allocating a minimum of 40 metres of land is likely to result in productive land been “wasted” on buffers / unproductive outcomes (this is particularly disconcerting for small landholdings).
Recommended approach

1. An appropriate level of Development Plan recognition should be afforded to the reasonable protection of:
   • ‘existing’ (sensitive) residential / tourism land uses (located in primary production or urban zones) where an agricultural land use is proposed
   • ‘existing’ primary production land uses where a residential / tourist accommodation is proposed.

   This approach will require updating Council-Wide Development Plan interface policies and relevant zone’s Desired Character statements. Updating of policies will discuss the concept of managing and/or minimising impacts, as opposed to completely halting impacts.

2. Introduce Council Wide Development Plan policy that in respect to new development as defined by the Development Act (including residential and tourist accommodation, or farming / horticulture; whichever seeks to be introduced into the locality) located adjoining a primary production and/or residential land use, should provide a buffer in the following manner:
   • Is located as close as practicable to the point of release of the spray
   • Has minimum total width of 40 metres made up of 10 metres cleared fire break area either side of a 20 metre wide planted area (existing roads / tracks can be included in the 10 metre cleared fire break area)
   • Contain random plantings of a variety of tree and shrub species of differing growth habitats, at spacing’s of 4 to 5 metres
   • Include species with long, thin (needle-like) and rough (furry/hairy) foliage which facilitates the more efficient capture of spray droplets and which are fast growing and hardy
   • Includes species that have foliage from the base to the crown and mixed plantings of trees to ensure there are no significant gaps in the lower canopy
   • Provide a permeable barrier of landscaping which allows air to pass through the buffer. A porosity of approximately 0.5 (that is approximately 50% of the landscape screen should be air space)
   • Have a mature tree height twice the height of the spray release height.

3. With regards to rural to rural interface issues, introduce a Council Wide Development Plan policy that promotes the need for an appropriate vegetated buffer having regard to local circumstances, in addition to listing new farming / horticulture land uses as a form of development requiring consultation with neighbouring land owners.
6. Primary Production diversification and value adding

Overview

The primary production zones currently restrict the development of buildings that are not associated with farming and primary production. This means that activities on farms that would diversify or add value to agricultural products are restricted.

There is demand from primary producers to undertake a greater range of activities to improve the economic viability of their farms including animal keeping, greenhouses, packing sheds, processing facilities, and sales outlets. The Addendum to the 30 Year Plan recognises the importance of primary production to the district and the many variable elements that will influence its evolution; including land capability, rainfall and emerging best practice. In this, the Addendum to the 30 Year Plan establishes policies that seek provision for flexible farming practices and encourages the opportunities for value adding activities to be undertaken where they complement the district’s primary production base.

Intensified development in primary production areas can impact upon character, landscape, and amenity that is valued by residents and visitors. It can also impact on other primary production operations by displacing valuable agricultural land.

Development Plan policies have a role in supporting a balance between protecting the productive value of arable land, while not unduly limiting opportunities for development in primary production areas that supports diversification, value adding, and increased efficiency. A review of policies in the General Section and each of the rural zones identifies a need for update planning policies to ensure better consistency and achieve the aims of the Addendum to the 30 Year Plan, local community and Council.

The feedback from consultation indicated there was general support for providing farmers with greater flexibility to diversify their products. There were some different views about how much flexibility and the need for regulation to manage potential impacts on the community and environment. There was however general support for small scale processing of produce sourced from the site, but not for produce sourced from beyond the site. There was a lesser degree of support for the development of workers’ accommodation in rural areas, second dwellings and restriction of undercover primary production.

Recommended approach

1. Allow small scale processing, packing, storage and sales (or combination thereof) to be assessed on its merits where:
   - Primary production is the predominant land use on the allotment/site
   - The processing, packing, storage or sales involves produce produced on the same site or allotment
   - The development results in the allotment containing a total floor area of no more than 250 square metres of processing, packing, storage or sales or combination thereof
   - The development is sited adjacent existing buildings on the allotment.
Proposals for processing, packing, storage or sales that do not meet these criteria would be assessed as non-complying.

2. Review Desired Character Statements of each rural zone to consistently contemplate development involving small scale processing, packing, storage and sales that has a low impact on the landscape and the operations of primary production.

3. Review policies of each rural zone to require development involving small scale processing, packing, storage and sales to achieve specific performance standards in relation to built form and visual impact, traffic and car parking, and impact on infrastructure (expanding upon existing policies relating to Form and Character, Wineries, Design and Appearance, Tourism Development, Transportation and Access, Siting and Visibility, Interface between Land Uses and Natural Resources in the General section).

4. Amend Industry PDC 12 in the General section of the Development Plan to remove the requirement for small scale agricultural industries in rural areas to occur only on an allotment where a habitable dwelling exists.

5. Remove PDC 24 of the Primary Production Zone that states that Intensive rural industries of a factory type, such as chicken and other poultry hatcheries and batteries, and other large buildings used for the intensive keeping of animals or intensive agriculture in an artificial environment should not be established or expanded and make these non-complying.

6. Strengthen principles and Desired Character Statements in each rural zone to clearly define envisaged and not envisaged forms of development, in particular enclosed primary production (not envisaged).

7. Amend Industry PDC 12 in the General section of the Development Plan requiring small scale agricultural industries in rural areas to process produce grown within the Mount Lofty Ranges Region. This policy is in Version 6 of the South Australian Planning Policy Library, and it is assumed this section of the module was developed to apply to the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed. The policy is also applicable throughout the Barossa’s rural areas, and it is considered the provision could not be reasonably applied.

8. Remove PDC 15 in the Primary Production Zone, PDC 20 in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone and PDC 28 in the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone that specify on site manoeuvring areas for orchards and vineyards.
7. Wineries and ancillary development / Tourism development (ancillary)

Overview

Viticulture and wine production contribute to both the economic prosperity and landscape of the Barossa and its attractiveness as a tourist destination. The Addendum to the 30 Year Plan recognises that the district is internationally recognised for its wine production. The complex soil and growing conditions is reflected in the tapestry of wine production across the entire Council. Addendum policies seek to protect the rural landscape, protection of primary production, allow provision for flexible farming and value adding.

As well as grape growing and wine production, these industries create demand for land uses ancillary to vineyards and wineries such as cellar doors, wine sales, and hospitality and tourist facilities. There is demand from wineries to expand the range of activities associated with cellar doors. Such development could however have a visual impact, has the potential to displace primary production land, and create a disturbance to neighbours. The Barossa is a highly regarded tourist destination, with significant appeal drawn from both the unique landscape character, and the attractions of the wine and food industry. As well as generating economic activity and diversification in itself, tourism can complement and add value to primary production - the core economic activity for the area.

The Development Plan does not have a consistent approach to assessing activities associated with wineries such as restaurants, function centres and tourist accommodation. Cellar doors for example, are subject to inconsistent polices and criteria across the different rural zones.

The Review considered introducing greater flexibility into the Development Plan to allow for more development ancillary to wineries. It also considered the types of limitations and controls that should be put in place to ensure the expansion of industrial and commercial activity does not have an adverse impact on visual amenity, traffic, noise and productive land.

There are specific policies for tourism development in the General Section of the Development Plan, however, the Review has sought to examine and identify opportunities for new ancillary tourism development in the rural zones (this excludes matters sought to be reviewed in the Tourism DPA identified in Council’s Strategic Directions Report.

The feedback from consultation was generally supportive of introducing greater flexibility in the Development Plan for the establishment of cellar doors in association with wineries. There was also general support for the policy option that would allow for the establishment of cellar doors not in association with any winery up to a maximum size. There was a view that wineries should be able to offer meals and to a lesser extent allow for function centres subject to scale, siting and design criteria. Ancillary development that supported the tourism industry was particularly supported. There were some concerns raised about the potential for negative impacts on visual amenity, noise and traffic that would need to be addressed through planning controls.

Recommended approach

Wineries and Ancillary Development

1. In each rural zone enable a cellar door, shop, restaurant or combination thereof to be assessed on its merit where it:
• is located on the same allotment as a vineyard of at least 0.5 hectares or on the same allotment as a winery
• results in the allotment containing a total floor area of no more than 250 square metres of cellar door, shop, restaurant or combination thereof
• is sited adjacent existing buildings on the allotment.

Any cellar doors, shops and restaurants that do not meet these criteria would be assessed as non-complying.

2. Review Desired Character Statements of each rural zone to contemplate development of small scale cellar doors, shops and restaurant associated with vineyards and wineries that have a low impact on the landscape and operations of primary production.

3. Review polices of each rural zone to require cellar doors, shops and restaurants to achieve specific performance standards in relation to built form and visual impact, traffic and car parking, and impact on infrastructure (expanding on existing policies relating to Form and Character, Wineries, Design and Appearance, Tourism Development, Transportation and Access, Siting and Visibility, Interface between Land Uses and Natural Resources in the General section).

4. Review classification of outbuildings, verandas and storage tanks in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone and Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone to allow minor ancillary development associated with primary production and wineries to be assessed on merit.

5. Review notification categories in each rural zone to allow minor ancillary development associated with primary production and wineries to be exempt from public notification.

Tourism Development (Ancillary)

1. In each rural zone allow tourist accommodation to be assessed on its merits where:
   • Primary production is the predominant land use on the subject allotment/site
   • The development is ancillary to an existing dwelling
   • The development has a total floor area of no more than 150 square metres
   • The development is sited adjacent existing buildings on the allotment.

Proposals for tourist accommodation that do not meet these criteria would be assessed as non-complying.

2. Review Desired Character Statements of each rural zone to contemplate small scale tourist accommodation, ancillary to primary production uses, that has low impacts on the landscape and operations of existing primary production.

3. Review polices of each rural zone to require small scale tourist accommodation to achieve specific performance standards in relation to built form and visual impact, traffic and car parking, and impact on infrastructure (noting the Development Plan contains existing policies relating to Form and Character, Wineries, Design and Appearance, Tourism Development, Transportation and Access, Siting and Visibility, Interface between Land Uses and Natural Resources in the General section).
8. Land Division, New Lots and Boundary Realignment

Overview:

The Development Plan currently aims to preserve the viability of primary production land by restricting the division of land and fragmentation of current land holdings. Land division that creates an additional allotment is generally restricted (as a non complying form of development) across the rural zones with the exception of the Concordia area where additional allotments are possible provided they are at least 40 hectares in area; or where annexing an existing State or local heritage item of no greater than 1 hectare in area.

The Development Plan also restricts major boundary realignment between two or more allotments that if allowed, could create smaller rural living scale lots and larger primary production allotments. Some minor boundary realignments are allowed subject to meeting key assessment criteria. Existing policies also discourage the creation of new allotments that could be suitable for smaller scale primary production (including mixed use farming), tourism activities and for dividing off existing dwellings.

The Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012 requires that land division within the Character Preservation District be refused, unless it is within a designated area (such as townships), complies with minimum lot and primary production use criteria. No land division solely for residential development is permitted. The 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide specifically speaks against the fragmentation of primary production land by restricting land division to maintain viability and production. The Planning Strategy Addendum reinforces the need to protect the predominantly rural landscape and preventing the loss of valuable production land.

An early component of the Review considered whether the existing controls on new allotments should be retained in the rural zones. The current restrictions were seen as necessary and generally in accord with strategic advice and Council direction.

The Review considered the creation of smaller allotments for primary production that could support the development of the food industry in the region through accompanying policy that would allow farmers flexibility to produce a range of food products such as intensive animal keeping or hydroponic enterprises. Similarly, the potential to allow major boundary realignments was also considered. The Review also addressed whether the Development Plan should allow for the creation additional allotments containing existing or former dwellings which contribute to local character to encourage their retention and reuse.

There was a consensus that protective controls should remain including the general policy intent for no new allotments to be created. There were isolated commentary from respondents who actively seek rural lifestyle opportunities or smaller primary production holdings. There was some support to allow for land amalgamation to respond to modern farming practices and improved production management. In different parts of the Council there was an expressed view to potentially allow for land division of undersized allotments for rural living purposes. This was both supported and opposed by respondents. The general overall response was to protect the Council from adverse land division activity.
**Recommended approach**

1. Land division which creates an additional allotment in the relevant zones and precincts to remain non-complying.

2. Remove the policy which provides for additional allotments to be created in the Primary Production Zone: Precinct 5 Concordia.

3. A boundary realignment which increase the number of small allotments which could accommodate a potential dwelling should not occur as rural dwelling potential is adequately catered for by existing amalgamation and proposed refined minimum lot size policies.

4. Retain the limitation on increasing the number of allotments less than 32 ha in the Primary Production Zone with exception of creating a smaller allotment around a dwelling which existed on the date any changes are approved subject to the dwelling being adequately separated from side boundaries and adjacent primary production activities.

5. Extend the limitation on increasing the number of allotments less than 32 ha in the Primary Production Zone to the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone.

6. Very small and unusable lots such as lots comprising a former closed road should not be used for boundary realignments with such proposals to be non-complying.

7. Establish a Council policy under the Local Government Act 1999 relating to requests to close a road with a fundamental principle being that any agreement by Council to close and sell the road will be conditional on the closed road being amalgamated with the adjacent land (i.e. there will be no increase in the number of allotments).
9. Dwellings in Rural Areas

Overview:

The Development Plan currently seeks to preserve the viability of primary production land and the rural qualities of the landscape by restricting the construction of new dwellings in rural areas. Some land owners would like to be able to build new dwellings on their properties to accommodate family members or farm workers. It has been suggested that allowing more dwellings on primary production land could increase its viability by facilitating new small-scale primary production and value-adding activities. Any increase in the number of dwellings in rural areas would however need to protect the rural qualities of the landscape and the viability of primary production land.

At present, planning policy restricts the number of new dwellings in rural areas by generally only allowing the construction of one dwelling per allotment, and in many areas, allotments must be of a minimum size for any dwelling to be approved. The policies vary across the council area, with different minimum allotments sizes applying in different areas, and in some areas, no minimum lot size required.

At the same time, the Development Plan also enables new dwellings as an incentive for the amalgamation of smaller contiguous allotments. Three or more allotments can be amalgamated into a single title in return for the ability to develop a dwelling (as a merit form of development), even if the size of the newly created single allotment is smaller than the minimum size for that area. This policy has been in place for many years without notable take-up.

The Review considered whether a minimum allotment size for new dwellings should apply, and if so what that size should be. It also considered whether land amalgamation should be further encouraged but based on area rather than a number of allotments as at present. It also considered whether a second dwelling should be allowed on an allotment and whether landowners should be able to transfer their right to develop a dwelling on one allotment to another allotment in a different area.

The overall feedback from consultation indicated a role for the Development Plan to continue to restrict the number of dwellings in rural areas in order to preserve the rural character of the landscape. The responses indicated strong support for the retention of minimum allotment sizes, although there were different views about what this should be. There was also some support for the potential for a second dwelling on an allotment where it is clustered with other dwelling and is intended for family or farm worker accommodation although a smaller number of respondents disagreed with this approach. There was limited support for policies that enable new dwellings through the amalgamation of small allotments.

The recommended policy options are to retain the use of minimum allotment sizes for new dwellings except on a small number of existing undersized allotments considered too small for primary production. The ‘special amalgamation’ polices are recommended to be removed.

Recommended approach

1. Acknowledge the presence of ‘undersized’ lots which may be unsuitable for traditional forms of primary production, which may benefit from reduced primary production, and those which should not be used for primary production due to adjacent sensitive uses or on environmental grounds, comprising allotments which are equal to or less than 10% of the nominated minimum lot size for a dwelling in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone, Barossa Range precinct and Moculta precinct.
2. Apply the following approach to a dwelling on undersized allotments in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone, Barossa Range precinct and Moculta precinct:
   • On a lot between 0.5 ha and 10% of the minimum specified = merit subject to satisfying location and other criteria
   • On a lot between 10% of the minimum specified and the minimum = non-complying
   • On a lot equal to or above the minimum specified = merit subject to satisfying location and other criteria.

3. Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone:
   • Retain 25 ha minimum lot size policy
   • Add lots in the 0.5-2.5 ha range to the Infill Dwelling Sites table OR provide that a dwelling on lots in this range is on merit
   • A dwelling on a lot below 0.5 ha to be non-complying due to potential wastewater management issues
   • Provide for Dependent Accommodation to be developed consistent with the policies in the General Section: Residential Development.

4. Barossa Range Precinct:
   • Reduce the 100 ha minimum lot size to 60 ha
   • Remove the special amalgamation option
   • Add lots in the 0.5-6 ha range to the Infill Dwelling Sites table OR provide that a dwelling on lots in this range is on merit
   • A dwelling on a lot below 0.5 ha to be non-complying due to potential wastewater management issues
   • Provide for Dependent Accommodation to be developed consistent with the policies in the General Section: Residential Development.

5. Moculta Precinct
   • Retain the 60 ha minimum lot size policy
   • Remove the special amalgamation option
   • Add lots in the 0.5-6 ha range to the Infill Dwelling Sites table OR provide that a dwelling on lots in this range is on merit
   • A dwelling on a lot below 0.5 ha to be non-complying due to potential wastewater management issues
   • Provide for Dependent Accommodation to be developed consistent with the policies in the General Section: Residential Development.

6. Paper Town Precinct
   • Retain the 32 ha minimum lot size policy.

7. Rural Landscape Protection Zone
• Retain the 100 ha minimum lot size policy
• Remove the special amalgamation option
• Only one dwelling on an allotment.

8. Primary Production Zone (Concordia Precinct and balance) and Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone:
• A dwelling on a lot below 0.5 ha to be non-complying due to potential wastewater management issues
• Extend the policy in the Concordia Precinct which states that a dwelling should only occur on an allotment greater than 32 hectares in area to the balance of the Primary Production Zone and to the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone
• Provide for Dependent Accommodation to be developed consistent with the policies in the General Section: Residential Development.

9. Retain and expand Table Baro/3: Infill Dwelling Sites to include sites that are unsuitable for traditional forms of primary production, those that may benefit from reduced primary production, and those which should not be used for primary production due to adjacent sensitive uses.

10. A dwelling on an allotment below 0.5 ha to be non-complying due to likely issues with on-site wastewater treatment, with the exception of allotments in Table Baro/3 Infill Dwelling Sites and identified on Concept Plan Map Baro/10 - Kroemer Crossing.

11. Development Plan policies to require applicants for dwellings in rural areas to demonstrate:
• Whether the dwelling will result in the loss or fragmentation of productive agricultural land
• That agriculture would remain the primary land use, supported by a business plan showing investment into agriculture on the property, estimated return, the amount of land engaged in farming and the estimated production from the property
• Why there is a need to live on site and how that would enhance agricultural use
• With the exception of undersized allotments or those in Table Baro/3: Infill Dwelling Sites, that it is likely that the land would remain in agricultural use into the future following development of the dwelling
• Whether the dwelling will be adversely affected by agricultural activities on adjacent and nearby land due to dust, noise, odour, use of chemicals and farm machinery, traffic and hours of operation
• Whether the dwelling will adversely affect the operation and expansion of adjoining and nearby agricultural uses.

12. For public notification purposes, all applications for a new dwelling to be a Category 2 form of development in the Primary Production Zone, Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone, Rural Landscape Protection Zone and Watershed Zone. This does not include any dwelling application that is determined to be a non-complying form of development.
10. Other policy issues

Recommended approach

1. Retain the existing four rural zone structure.

2. Merge the Barossa Range and Moculta precincts.

3. Remove the Concordia precinct policies on the basis that the policies that currently differentiate that precinct from other parts of the Primary Production Zone are to be removed or extended to apply to the entire zone – i.e. potential to create additional lots of at least 40 ha (to be removed), 32 ha desired minimum lot size for a dwelling (to extend to all portions of the Primary Production Zone outside the Eastern Barossa precinct and to apply to the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone), restriction on intensive animal keeping and horticulture (to be removed).

4. Review the need to retain the “Watershed” reference in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region Zone.

5. In conjunction with the Light Regional Council review the merits of converting the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone into a generic shared Policy Area within the Primary Production Zone.

6. Reformat the non-complying list in the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone to improve clarity, reduce confusion and achieve clearer planning outcomes.

7. Retain the Rural Landscape Protection Zone as a separate zone rather than converting it to a Policy Area layer within the Primary Production Zone.

8. In the Primary Production Zone, review the land division exception criteria regarding the criteria to be met in order for a proposal to be on merit.

9. Insert relevant policies in the Primary Production Zone, Rural Landscape Protection Zone and Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone to ensure any proposal for alterations, additions or replacement of an existing dwelling can be considered as a merit form of development.

10. Review the potential to introduce appropriate policies into the General Section regarding horse keeping stocking rates and the potential to amend the Rural Living Zone non-complying list to provide that horse keeping below a certain stocking rate is on merit.

11. Review the non-complying status of ‘dam’ in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone, Rural Landscape Protection Zone and Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone and the potential for dams to be assessed on their merits with the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources ultimately streamlining whether a proposal proceeds via relevant Water Allocation Plan provisions.

12. Review the need to retain or amend existing Barossa Exclusion Area policies in the context of other recommended changes regarding wineries and ancillary development, landscape character and building siting and design.

13. Review potential inclusion of Primary Production Priority Areas mapping and associated policies into the Development Plan once an agreed high level strategic approach between State and Local government is in place.
Character Preservation Area

DPTI comment:

“It is acknowledged that the SOI has been initiated in response to the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012 and subsequent Planning Strategy Addendum, however the relationship between the investigations proposed and the five character values identified in this Act are not strongly demonstrated in the SOI.

The Department considers that the SOI should more clearly indicate how the DPA will address the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act and will be in accord with the Planning Strategy Addendum.

In particular it is noted that the SOI anticipates reviewing requirements and policies relating to dwellings and land division (including boundary realignments) in the Primary Production Zones. The Department is mindful of how Council consider additional dwellings within the Primary Production Zones to be consistent with the preservation of natural landscapes and the protection of primary production resources and practices. The Department considers that the DPA should not seek to create additional potential for dwellings or for rural living allotments. The SOI should therefore demonstrate that a review of policies relating to dwellings will be in keeping with the intent of the Character Preservation Area and that through the investigations for the DPA any potential yields that may be created through the proposed policy will be identified and justified accordingly.

Council should however provide some preliminary analysis of the above matters to assist the Department in conveying the merits of the anticipated amendments to the Minister.”

Council response/action taken:

• Additional discussion has been included under heading “2.1.1 Rationale” in the SOI to indicate where the Strategic Directions Report (SDR) and Rural Areas and Character Review (RACR) work identified gaps and shortcomings between the PSA/Act and existing development policies.

• Council considers the DPA does not seek to create additional potential for rural living allotments. In fact, existing limitations on creation of additional allotments are proposed to be extended to cover all four zones and precincts (currently additional lots can be created in the Concordia precinct). While revised policies may enable a smaller allotment to be created around an existing dwelling, the intent is not to create additional small ‘vacant’ rural lots. Additionally the intent is for realignment of lots comprising former closed roads to be non-complying.

• The proposal is to also remove the (unusual) ‘special’ amalgamation policy which for one reason or another has not been taken up to our knowledge, but also which could have adverse or unintended consequences if acted on (refer to discussion in the review document).

• The intent is to review existing restrictions on dwellings in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone and the Primary Production Zone’s Moculta and Barossa
Range precincts. The RACR analysed the potential impact of these changes, concluding that the location of the additional ‘qualifying’ lots suggests that subject to strict siting and design criteria, in the majority of instances a dwelling on those lots would be unlikely to adversely impact on landscape character or primary production.

- Council does not intend to reduce existing potential for dwellings in those areas where no restriction currently exists – e.g. in the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone other than to provide that an allotment should be at least 0.5 ha in area for wastewater disposal reasons – see below.

- The State Government introduced a non-complying approach via the *Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale Protection Districts DPA* and subsequent *Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale – Revised – Protection Districts DPA* as a “holding measure”. This was subsequently reversed with dwellings returning to merit status. Council considers that to once again make dwellings non-complying would cause unnecessary angst and grief within the community. In effect the Minister, in reversing the “holding” measure, indicated to the community that he accepted additional dwellings in those currently unrestricted areas and there was no indication in the Planning Strategy Addendum that policies should be ‘tightened’ in those areas.

- Notwithstanding the above, Council intends to introduce tighter policies in that dwellings on lots below 0.5 ha would be non-complying, plus will seek to extend the policy which currently exists in the Concordia precinct indicating that dwellings should be on lots of 32 ha and above, to other zones.

- There is currently potential for 625 additional dwellings in the unrestricted zones and in the Concordia precinct. Under the intended approach relating to lots < 0.5 ha this number would be reduced by 39 to 586. 298 of these lots are 32 ha or above, therefore in practice the PDC that lots be at least 32 ha will require up to 288 applicants to demonstrate why that policy should not apply. In addition applicants for all 586 lots will need to satisfy existing and proposed additional obligations to demonstrate connection with primary production, impact on primary production etc.

- Regarding ‘need’ for a dwelling, Council intends to seek additional justification from applicants in respect to the need for a dwelling on a rural allotment, the potential impact on primary production etc. It will also seek to introduce separation distances between a dwelling and adjacent primary production.

- The effect of the proposed changes outlined above should be to restrict future ‘rural living’ dwellings while still accommodating dwellings used in association with existing or proposed primary production enterprises.

**Priority Primary Production Areas**

*DPTI comment:*

“The identification and mapping of Priority Primary Production Areas (PPPAs) by PIRSA is an important tool for Councils to use when reviewing key primary production areas. As such, it is important that the SOI include that the investigations for the DPA will include consideration (or ground truthing) of these areas which may assist to further complement the Character Preservation Area and ensure the key areas of primary production are appropriately protected with a suitable suite of Development Plan policies.”
Council response/action taken:

- There is currently no agreed approach in respect to how to implement PPPA mapping – e.g. as to how or should priority areas be shown on Development Plan maps, and if shown whether this is as an overlay or a precinct.
- There is no guarantee that PPPA mapping will or reasonably can be incorporated into Development Plans.
- Including maps – e.g. via an overlay – in the absence of associated/linked development policies has limited value.
- Any policies need to demonstrate or be based on the premise that an area shown as PPPA differs from a non-PPPA area. One line of thinking implies that the range of permitted land uses and forms of development in a PPPA area needs differ from a non-PPPA area otherwise without those variations, what is the role of showing them in a Development Plan?
- Can non-PPPA areas be considered for alternative development? If not, then ask again what is the purpose, in a development control perspective, of showing them in the Development Plan?
- In any case, our existing zoning pattern generally recognises/respects the PPPA regime – e.g. the Rural Landscape Protection Zone generally correlates with a non-PPPA area whereas the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone generally aligns with a PPPA area.
- Each rural zone seeks to promote primary production and to protect land for future production. This zoning framework is considered appropriate in the absence of an agreed Statewide approach.

Potential Development Plan Policy Changes

DPTI comment:

“The Department notes the extensive range of issues to be investigated and addressed through the DPA process and in general supports the direction indicated by Council in the SOI. However the Department considers that this section of the SOI contains significant policy positions that are not appropriate for inclusion as they are predetermining the outcome of the DPA prior to the investigations being undertaken. The attached track changes version of the SOI has been included to demonstrate some of the key changes that are considered appropriate to the SOI. Council’s consideration of the attached draft SOI is requested, any comments or further changes can be discussed with the Department."

Council response/action taken:

- The proposed policy position results from thorough investigations as part of the RACR process. Despite this the SOI has been revised as necessary to reduce the potential for readers to assume the changes are a forgone conclusion but will be investigated and subsequently justified.
Consistency of Zoning

**DPTI comment:**

“As discussed above, the Department is working towards a more consistent policy framework for Primary Production and Watershed Protection zones. It is currently being investigated if the existing Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone could be converted into an Overlay in the General Section of Development Plans, with a review of the non complying list format. The Department will continue to liaise with Council as investigations on this continue and anticipate that Council should be able to include any outcomes in the draft DPA for consultation.

In addition the Department supports the reduction in zones and as such supports the proposed investigation into converting the existing Primary Production (Barossa Valley) Zone into a Policy Area of the Primary Production Zone. In recognition of the Character Preservation Area the retention of the Rural Landscape Protection Zone as a Zone is supported.”

**Council response/action taken:**

- Noted; however Council would still seek the ability to adopt a different approach where the character preservation policies or unique local conditions warrant a different approach – e.g. The RACR did not support the clustering approach (via boundary realignment) which appears to be at odds with the approach taken by Mount Barker and Alexandrina but we would seek the ability to explore and implement this approach.

Public Consultation Process

**DPTI comment:**

“In light of the ongoing discussions between the Department, relevant Councils and government agencies on this issue it is requested that Council amend the SOI to reflect that the DPA will follow Process B1 (consultation approval required). This will ensure that the DPA for consultation is consistent with the other DPAs being undertaken and in line with the investigations being undertaken across the region.”

**Council response/action taken:**

- Council assumes “this issue” refers to the desire for consistency across the various councils and on this basis reluctantly accepts the consultation approval approach.
- However Council trusts that the consultation approval process will be efficient and that analysis will focus on the level of ‘framework’ consistency across the Primary Production and Watershed Protection zones rather than specific local policy adjustments or initiatives. In this context the task of seeking consistency across at least four DPAs which will invariably be submitted for consultation approval over an extended period will be complex, and as indicated above, some discretion will need to apply where one DPA proposes a different approach to respond to unique local conditions or trends.
Mr Martin McCarthy  
Chief Executive Officer  
The Barossa Council  
PO Box 867  
NURIOOTPA SA 5355

Attention: Mr Paul Mickan, Principal Planner

Dear Mr McCarthy

Thank you for the Rural Areas and Character Development Plan Amendment (DPA) Statement of Intent (SOI).

I agree that this SOI forms an appropriate basis for the preparation of the proposed DPA pursuant to section 25(1) of the Development Act 1993 (the Act). A copy of the SOI is attached. I request that Council add Primary Producers SA and ElectraNet to the list of interested parties to be consulted during the consultation stage of the DPA.

There are a number of Councils that are currently undertaking DPAs to review primary production issues. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (the Department) is working with each of these Councils (and relevant government agencies) to ensure a consistent policy approach where possible, particularly in regard to the following issues:

- Boundary realignments and land division
- Secondary dwellings
- Rural value adding and farm gate sales
- Buffers/interface
- Watershed protection.

In light of the ongoing investigations on this issue, it is requested that Council liaise with the Department during the preparation of the DPA to ensure that the DPA is consistent with the other DPAs being undertaken and in line with the investigations being undertaken across the region.

This DPA will be monitored as part of the State Government’s objective to speed up rezoning and Council must commit to the timetable.
I understand that delays can be unexpected and that some issues may be difficult to resolve. Council is encouraged to raise any issues early in the process and advise the Department who may assign officers to assist in facilitating a resolution.

Council must secure my agreement to update the DPA timetable if it appears at any stage that an extension will be required (as per regulation 9(1)(l) of the Development Regulations 2008). This request should be made directly to the Department.

In the event that the DPA does not proceed in accordance with the agreed timetable and no formal agreement has been reached to extend the timetable, I will consider lapsing the DPA pursuant to section 25(19) of the Act.

For more information, please refer to the Department’s Technical Guide to Development Plan Amendments via the Practitioner Information webpage at www.sa.gov.au/planning/practitionersguide during each stage of the DPA process to ensure that all legislative and technical requirements are met.

If you require any assistance or additional information, please contact Abi Coad, Chief Project Officer, on 7109 7039 or by email abi.coad@sa.gov.au.

I trust this information is of assistance.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

John Rau
Deputy Premier
Minister for Planning

Att.
The Barossa Council Development Plan

Rural Areas and Character

by

The Barossa Council

20 May 2015

Pursuant to section 25 (1) of the Development Act 1993 this Statement of Intent forms the agreed basis for the preparation of the proposed Development Plan Amendment.

Martin McCarthy

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Date: 22/5/15

John Rau

MINISTER FOR PLANNING

Date: 28/7/15
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1. Introduction

1.1 Statement of Intent

Pursuant to section 25(1) of the Development Act 1993 (the Act) The Barossa Council (the Council) has reached agreement with the Minister on this Statement of Intent (SOI) prepared by the Council in accordance with the Development Regulations 2008 (the Regulations).

The SOI details the scope, relevant strategic / policy considerations, and nature of investigations to be carried out, the consultation process and timeframes to be followed in preparing the DPA.

1.2 Chief Executive Statement

The Chief Executive Officer of the Council confirms the following:

- The proposed DPA will assist in implementing the Planning Strategy and the Addendum to two volumes of the South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and Murray and Mallee Region Plan: Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale Character Preservation, December 2013 (the Planning Strategy Addendum).
- The proposed DPA has been endorsed by Council.
- All procedures, documentation and mapping will accord with relevant statutory requirements of the Act and Regulations.
- Sufficient Council resources will be devoted to completing the DPA within the agreed timeframe. Council acknowledges that the Minister can lapse the DPA if key timeframes are not met by Council pursuant to section 25(19) of the Act.
- Council may use the outcome of investigations and other information produced by external sources which will be reviewed by a qualified, independent professional advisor (pursuant to section 25(4) of the Act).

1.2.1 Council Contact Person

The key Council contact person who will be responsible for managing the DPA process and who will receive all official documents relating to the DPA is:

- Paul Mickan

1.2.2 Developer Supported DPA

- N/A
The Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012 was gazetted in January 2013. The Act has been put in place to protect and enhance the special character of the Barossa Valley character preservation district (refer to Figure 1) while at the same time providing for the economic, social and physical well-being of the community.

It seeks to prevent activities and development that would have an adverse effect on the special character of the district. The Act introduces the following five character values to describe the unique character and identity of the Barossa which must be used to guide future development in the District:

- rural and natural landscape and visual amenity
- heritage attributes
- built form of the townships as they relate to the district
- viticultural, agricultural and associated industries
- scenic and tourism attributes.

The Act also contemplated an alteration to the Planning Strategy and a review of Development Plans to ensure policies give effect to the special character of the District; and to establish criteria for future development assessment. The first step in this process was completed through the Planning Strategy Addendum with The Barossa Council and its community being active participants in providing input into the preparation of the Planning Strategy Addendum.

The transitional arrangements set out require the Minister to ensure that The Barossa Council Development Plan be reviewed within 6 months of the release of the Planning Strategy Addendum, so as to determine whether any amendments are needed to align with either the Planning Strategy and/or the operation and effect of the character preservation law.
In association with the Character Preservation legislation, the Minister authorised the 'Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale – Revised – Protection Districts DPA on 18 January 2013. The DPA introduced a Protection District Overlay and the following related Development Plan Objectives:

1. A district where:
   (a) scenic and rural landscapes are highly valued, retained and protected
   (b) development near entrances to towns and settlements does not diminish the rural setting, character and heritage values associated with those towns and settlements
   (c) the long term use of land for primary production and associated value adding enterprises is assured and promoted
   (d) activities positively contribute to tourism
   (e) the heritage attributes of the district are preserved
   (f) buildings and structures complement the landscape.

2. Residential development is located inside townships, settlements and rural living areas.
In this context, the Council completed its Strategic Directions Report 2013 (SDR) which prioritised the need to undertake a Rural Areas and Character Review and to prepare associated planning policy amendments that seek to resolve a range of rural and character policy issues, consistent with the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012 and Development Act 1993 requirements. The investigations and community consultation process associated with the Rural Areas and Character Review can be summarised by the flow chart in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Summary of Investigations and Community Consultation Leading to the Statement of Intent

The process included:

- Establishment and scheduling several community working group meetings to valid issues and potential policy directions
- Undertaking a community engagement program requesting the communities opinions on a range of policy options
- Undertaking a government agencies workshop on 6 August 2014
- Preparation of a Review report and Consultation Report which were adopted by Council on 10 September 2014
- Preparation of this Statement of Intent.
2.1.2 Affected Area

The area affected by the proposed DPA essentially comprises the following zones as shown on the following map:

- Primary Production Zone
- Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone
- Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone
- Rural Landscape Protection Zone.

![Map showing zones affected by the proposed DPA](image)

Figure 3: Map showing zones affected by the proposed DPA

2.1.3 Potential Issues

The key issue associated with this proposed DPA is to balance the requirement to recognise, protect and enhance the special character of the area while providing for the economic, physical and social wellbeing of the communities within it.

The *Rural Areas and Character Review* identified various aspects where existing Development Plan policies do not adequately align with policies within the Character Preservation legislation and the Planning Strategy Addendum, particularly in relation to design, siting and landscaping measures for...
new development. As an example, the Primary Production Zone contains detailed policies relating to the scale and height of new dwellings, including associated non-complying triggers, whereas similar criteria is absent from sensitive and significant areas such as the Rural Landscape Protection Zone and the valley floor area. The Development Plan also contains little guidance in respect to the design and siting of farm and horticultural buildings. The *Rural Areas and Character Review* also identified opportunities to facilitate appropriate primary production value-adding and diversification and small-scale tourism development.

The broad policy direction and potential policy changes to ensure that the Development Plan policies better align with the Planning Strategy and Planning Strategy Addendum and to address issues identified are articulated in the *Rural Areas and Character Review Main Report* but broadly relate to the following matters:

- Landscape character
- Building siting and design
- Interface and buffer management
- Wineries and ancillary development
- Primary production diversification and value adding
- Tourism development in rural areas
- Land division, new lot and boundary realignment
- Dwellings in rural areas
- Other issues including:
  - Addressing minor anomalies throughout the Plan
  - Finetuning zone boundaries
  - Finetuning non-complying lists
  - Fine-tuning Public Notification categories.
### 3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

#### 3.1 The Planning Strategy

##### 3.1.1 Targets

The DPA will support the relevant volume of the Planning Strategy by implementing the following key targets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>How the target will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The economy and jobs: Employment distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target A Provide for 282,000 additional jobs during the next 30 years. The regional distribution of additional jobs is: ... 38,500 in the Barossa ...</td>
<td>The DPA will review policies relating to primary production and value adding aimed at increasing diversity and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B Distribute jobs across Greater Adelaide as: ... 128,500 broadly distributed across the region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C Plan for 15,900 green-collar jobs during the Plan’s first 15 years. (Green jobs are defined as positions in agriculture... aimed at alleviating the myriad environmental threats faced by humanity.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The economy and jobs: Primary Production</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target E Protect up to 375,000 hectares of significant primary production areas.</td>
<td>The environmental and economic sustainability of primary production in the Council area is a key driver for the DPA. Proposed policy amendments will assist in protecting significant areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target F Plan for an additional 2000 primary production jobs in Greater Adelaide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The economy and jobs: Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target M Plan for 84,900 additional services sector jobs in Greater Adelaide.</td>
<td>The DPA will review policies relating to small scale tourism development, wineries, cellar doors and associated activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The economy and jobs: Green industries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target N Plan for 15,900 new green-collar jobs in Greater Adelaide during the Plan’s first 15 years.</td>
<td>The DPA will review policies relating to primary production and value adding aimed at increasing diversity and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>How the target will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target A</strong> Protect 115,000 hectares (13 per cent of Greater Adelaide) of existing natural areas identified as areas of high environmental significance in Map D19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration will be given to identifying areas of conservation significance (particularly proclaimed areas) within a Conservation Zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target B</strong> Maintain the existing range of lower intensity land uses, such as primary production, across 156,500 hectares (identified as areas of environmental significance in Map D19). Where the retention of lower intensity land use cannot be achieved, impacts will be minimised and offset.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary production will be maintained as the primary land use within the rural areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target D</strong> Create 15,900 new green jobs in the first 15 years of the Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DPA will review policies relating to primary production and value adding aimed at increasing diversity and sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target E</strong> Protect and maintain the water supply catchment of the Mount Lofty Ranges, which comprises 159,000 hectares as identified in Map D23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While the DPA will review the applicable zones (including the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone) with a view to simplifying the number of rural zones applying in the Council area, the integrity of the watershed policies will be maintained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target F</strong> Protect and maintain the water reservoirs as identified in Map D23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target G</strong> Protect from inappropriate development and maintain prescribed water resources, as identified in Map D24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3.2 Policies

The DPA will support the relevant volume of the Planning Strategy and Planning Strategy Addendum by implementing the following policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>How the policy will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and the Planning Strategy Addendum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New transit corridors, growth areas, transit-oriented developments and activity centres: New metropolitan and township growth areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>How the policy will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 42</strong> Restrict ad hoc construction of rural dwellings and subdivision of rural lands through the planned expansion of townships, density increases within township boundaries, and appropriate intensification of existing Rural Living zones, and strategic designation of new Rural Living zones, outside areas of primary production significance.</td>
<td>The issue of dwellings and land division within rural areas will be carefully considered in order to maintain/improve the economic sustainability of primary production while recognising the special character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 43</strong> Prevent the expansion and/or inappropriate intensification of existing, or the creation of new, Rural Living Zones in areas of primary production significance.</td>
<td>Review of rural living policies is not being considered in this DPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 44</strong> Manage the interface between primary production activities and urban areas and townships through the identification of appropriate separation buffers, screening vegetation and appropriate alignment of allotment boundaries.</td>
<td>Policies for separation buffers will be reviewed and expanded to provide greater clarity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Urban design**
*Policy 7* Ensure building design can be adapted in the future to minimise new building requirements and maximise the re-use and redevelopment of existing infrastructure. | Policies relating to dependent accommodation in rural areas will be reviewed to provide flexibility for family, related persons, tourists and workers in ancillary accommodation facilities. |
| **Communities and social inclusion**
*Policy 5* Plan for the projected increase in the number of elderly people and respond to their preference to remain living in their existing community. | Policies relating to dependent accommodation in rural areas will be reviewed to encourage ageing in place for family and related persons. |
| **Health and Wellbeing**
*Policy 3* Protect Greater Adelaide's high-quality food bowl areas (for example, Virginia) to ensure a supply of affordable fresh food. | The environmental and economic sustainability of primary production in the Council area is a key driver for the DPA. Proposed policy amendments will assist in protecting significant areas. |
| **The economy and Jobs: Primary Production**
*Policy 11* Improve primary production's share of economic activity in Greater Adelaide through the protection of strategic areas for horticulture, | The environmental and economic sustainability of primary production in the Council area is a key driver for the DPA. Proposed policy |
### 3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>How the policy will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viticulture, dairying and grain production (see Map D11).</td>
<td>amendments will assist in protecting significant areas while providing flexibility in agricultural types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 13</strong> Designate areas of primary production significance (see Map D11) in Development Plans and introduce a standard set of planning controls to protect the areas' use.</td>
<td>Areas identified as being of Primary Production significance will be taken into account in reviewing the policy base to ensure that they are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 14</strong> Use measures, including planning controls, to protect important primary production areas such as the Barossa Valley, Willunga Basin and Northern Adelaide Plains.</td>
<td>Areas identified as being of Primary Production significance will be taken into account in reviewing the policy base to ensure that they are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 15</strong> Prevent the fragmentation of primary production land by restricting land subdivision to maintain viable and productive land-use activity. These planning controls will differ across Greater Adelaide, depending on the dominant activity of a particular area and the appropriate minimum lot size of that type of agricultural activity.</td>
<td>Land division policies will be reviewed to enable productive land use activity while protecting against loss for rural living type activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 16</strong> Remove unnecessary regulatory barriers to the adjustment of primary production activities. Development Plans should be flexible enough to allow property holders to change agricultural practices or commodity type, particularly where the change would enable increased productivity or better environmental outcomes.</td>
<td>Land use policies will be reviewed to ensure appropriate rural land uses can occur in the zones. Consideration will also be given to whether different agricultural land uses can harmoniously co-exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 17</strong> Encourage the development of small-scale value-adding activity that complements local primary production. Large-scale value adding activity should be located outside areas of primary production significance.</td>
<td>Appropriate small-scale value adding will be encouraged in the DPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 18</strong> Collocate intensive primary industries and compatible processing activities to reduce land-use conflict and achieve efficiencies in production, processing, distribution, energy efficiency and waste recycling, taking into account environmental, bio-security, infrastructure and rural amenity issues</td>
<td>Issues associated with more intensive primary industries will be reviewed and, where appropriate, policy amendments made to support their co-location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Policy and Implementation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>How the policy will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The economy and jobs: Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 35</strong> Provide for sustainable tourism developments across Greater Adelaide, in line with the South Australian Tourism Plan 2009, including:</td>
<td>Review of tourism policies will be undertaken to ensure that appropriate tourism opportunities are provided. This review will focus primarily on small scale opportunities in rural areas, with policies for larger scale facilities to be considered at a later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- protecting, enhancing and promoting the qualities that attract tourism and are of value to the whole community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- providing appropriate support infrastructure for tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- facilitating sustainably designed tourism accommodation in suitable locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- facilitating tourism-related developments, such as restaurants, specialty retail and accommodation, that add value to existing enterprises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The economy and jobs: Green industries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 38</strong> Ensure planning controls for employment lands are flexible enough to allow new green technologies and industries to emerge.</td>
<td>Land use policies will be reviewed to ensure appropriate rural land uses can occur in the zones including contemporary value-adding opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 1</strong> Introduce a clear hierarchy of environmental assets to be protected to improve development certainty and transparency ...</td>
<td>Consideration will be given to identifying areas of conservation significance (particularly proclaimed areas) within a Conservation Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate the protection of these areas into Development Plans ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Areas of high environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Areas of environmental significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. Areas designated for human use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 3</strong> Avoid where possible any impact on biodiversity...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate change: Water</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy 5</strong> Protect water supply catchments and the watershed by preventing high-risk development in catchments and watershed areas that are considered vulnerable, consistent with the water</td>
<td>While the DPA will review the applicable zones (including the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone) with a view to simplifying the number of rural zones applying in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>How the policy will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quality risk hierarchy ... associated with the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed priority areas, and ensure that new developments have a beneficial, or at least neutral, impact on water quality in the watershed.</td>
<td>Council area, the integrity of the watershed policies will be maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Planning Strategy Addendum policies:**

**The rural and natural landscape and visual amenity of the district**

- Preserve the district as a separate entity from suburban Adelaide and promote a clear transition between village style townships and the rural landscape.  
  - The DPA has a focus on providing/maintaining the rural area and landscape.

- Identify and protect areas with recognised biodiversity and conservation value, including areas of native bushland, remnant vegetation, scattered trees and vegetation and habitats along watercourses and road reserves.  
  - Consideration will be given to identifying areas of conservation significance (particularly proclaimed areas) within a Conservation Zone. Policies will be reviewed to ensure areas outside of such a zone can also be protected.

- Identify and protect important views in the district which contribute to the visual amenity and special character.  
  - Policies will be reviewed to ensure the foreground areas of important views can be protected.

- Ensure the scale, siting, design and landscaping of built form harmonises with the natural features of the landscape and its historic pattern of settlement.  
  - Policies will be reviewed to ensure appropriate landscaping of new development.

- Provide for the re-use of rural structures and historic buildings to support their preservation and ongoing contribution to the landscape.  
  - Policies will be reviewed to ensure appropriate re-use of buildings can occur.

- Reinforce the predominantly rural landscape, allowing a mix of land uses and diverse farming practices which complement the existing pattern of development.  
  - Land use policies will be reviewed to ensure appropriate rural land uses can occur in the zones. Consideration will also be given to whether different agricultural land uses can harmoniously co-exist.

- Provide for development required to maintain the economic viability of primary production which is a key rural attribute of the district.  
  - Land use policies will be reviewed to ensure appropriate rural land uses can occur in the zones. Appropriate small-scale value adding will also be encouraged in the DPA.
### Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage attributes</th>
<th>How the policy will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identify, maintain and enhance the heritage character and historic fabric of the district.</td>
<td>While not an issue being directly considered in this DPA, the maintenance of the heritage character of the district will be taken into account in reviewing land use and land division policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect and enhance areas of rural and natural landscape heritage including areas that contribute to biodiversity.</td>
<td>These are key aims of the DPA, acknowledging the need to ensure appropriate rural land uses can occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achieve a balance of heritage and new development having regard to scale, design, layout, and siting.</td>
<td>Design and siting of buildings/structures is a key element in protecting the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate well designed new development that integrates and enhances heritage buildings, places or streetscapes.</td>
<td>While this DPA is not considering ‘township’ heritage matters, these issues will be considered in relation to rural heritage matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and promote the adaptive and economical re-use of heritage or character buildings.</td>
<td>Policies providing for the re-use of heritage or character buildings in the rural areas will be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Built form of townships as they relate to the district

| • Maintain a separation between the towns in the district and the surrounding areas. | This DPA is not proposing any expansion of township areas. |
| • Maintain and manage the interface between primary production, industrial and residential activities. | Policies dealing with interface issues will be reviewed to ensure they are practical in nature while providing the required level of protection. |
| • Reinforce the predominantly low scale development at the town edges, both inside the town boundary and in the adjoining rural areas. | Only a limited number of additional dwellings within the rural area are being considered. |

### Viticulture, agriculture and associated industries

| • Protect and maintain the open rural landscape by achieving a balance between visual amenity and productive land use. | Only a limited number of additional dwellings within the rural area are being considered. Value adding activities and shedding associated... |
### 3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>How the policy will be implemented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect primary production areas to ensure that valuable land is not lost from production.</td>
<td>This is a key feature of the DPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make provision for flexible farming practices and ability to change between farming types e.g. horticultural, agricultural and viticultural uses to allow producers to respond to changing environmental and market conditions.</td>
<td>Land use policies will be reviewed to ensure appropriate rural land uses can occur in the zones. Consideration will also be given to whether different agricultural land uses can harmoniously co-exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the operation of existing primary production activities from adverse impacts of new primary production.</td>
<td>Land use policies will be reviewed to ensure appropriate rural land uses can occur in the zones. Consideration will also be given to whether different agricultural land uses can harmoniously co-exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for value adding activities that complement the district’s primary production.</td>
<td>Appropriate small-scale value adding will be encouraged in the DPA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenic and tourism attributes of the district

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate investment in new tourism initiatives which enhance the scenic and tourism attributes of the district.</td>
<td>Review of tourism policies will be undertaken to ensure that appropriate tourism opportunities are provided. This review will focus primarily on small scale opportunities, with larger scale facilities to be considered at a later date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote improvements to tourism infrastructure including transport networks, trails, cycle ways, signage, visitor information, and key gateways to towns.</td>
<td>These aspects of tourism development are not being considered as part of this DPA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote investment in new tourism initiatives that complement and add value to the special character of the district.</td>
<td>Review of tourism policies will be undertaken to ensure that appropriate tourism opportunities are provided. This review will focus primarily on small scale opportunities, with larger scale facilities to be considered at a later date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevent loss of agricultural land or heritage elements that would detract from the scenic attributes of the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environmental and economic sustainability of primary production in the Council area is a key driver for the DPA. Proposed policy amendments will assist in protecting significant areas and indirectly heritage elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and protect scenic landscapes and associated vistas incorporating significant elements including large trees and stone walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies will be reviewed to ensure protection of significant landscapes, recognising that changes to the landscape may be necessary in supporting the ongoing development of primary production activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Council Policies

3.2.1 Council’s Strategic Directions (Section 30) Report

Council’s Strategic Directions Report (August 2013) supports the proposed DPA. It recommended the preparation of two DPAs as follows:

- Character DPA (2013/14)

  The DPA will address the revised strategic policy framework resulting from the amendment to the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and responses from the community during recent engagement work.

  The DPA will examine the suitability of current policy in achieving the new objectives and targets in the amendment to the 30 Year Plan, plus more localised design and visual impact considerations. There is an acknowledged need for updated design policies across the Council and the DPA will review the desired character statements and policy provisions in a number of zones in order to achieve sought after design outcomes. This may include policies for the protection of scenic quality and minimisation of visual impact. The DPA will also look at the General Section and zone policies for design and siting policies for farm buildings and dwellings (primarily outside of the townships).

- Rural Areas Review and Rural Areas DPA(s) (2013/14)

  The DPA will examine the suitability of the existing rural zones and precincts. This is intended to be a comprehensive review that will investigate potential policy changes relating to a diversity of rural issues – dwellings, horticulture, ancillary development, Primary Production Priority Areas mapping, employment uses, restricted activities and effectiveness and suitability of existing buffer and interface policies.

  As part of the DPA, existing desired character statements and envisaged uses will be reviewed in rural or similar zones.
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3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

In effect, this proposed Rural Areas and Character DPA will combine the key elements of the above two DPAs into one.

3.2.2 Infrastructure Planning

The proposed amendment will be consistent with current infrastructure planning (both social and physical) identified in council's Strategic Directions Report, by the Minister, by a relevant government agency, and the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. Initiatives include:

- A transit corridor from Gawler to Concordia and Roseworthy South to Roseworthy
- Capital works to major electricity transmission feeders and major gas pipelines for Roseworthy, Gawler and Concordia
- Protection and enhancement of major freight corridors with potential future road capital works to facilitate freight movement
- A north-east bypass around Gawler which is subject to further investigation.
- Supporting infrastructure for Concordia/Kalbeeba.
- Ensure that development in affected zones complies with AS 2885 (Pipeline Gas and Liquid Petroleum) to meet minimum pipeline safety requirements.
- Protect infrastructure such as transmission networks and commercial gas transmission pipes that traverses the Council area.

Within this context, the policy amendments considered likely to result from this DPA are not expected to result in any significant impacts on the infrastructure planning listed above.

3.2.3 Other Policies or Local Issues

The policies of this DPA will be consistent with the policies in:

- The General Section of the Development Plan, including:
  - Design and Appearance
  - Industrial Development
  - Interface between Land Uses
  - Land Division
  - Landscaping, Fences and Walls
  - Natural Resources
  - Siting and Visibility
  - Sloping Land
  - Tourism Development.

- Council’s Current DPAs
  - Lyndoch Residential
3. Strategic and Policy Considerations

- The Development Plans of adjoining areas
  - Town of Gawler
  - Light Regional Council
  - Playford Council
  - Adelaide Hills Council
  - Mid Murray Council

- Schedule 4 of the Regulations

The focus of this DPA is on protecting the rural areas for primary production and on the need for development to retain the identified special character of the area. In this context, any increase in dwelling numbers within the rural area will be limited and will only occur following rigorous assessment against detailed design and siting criteria. On this basis, no change is proposed to the Residential Code area already established for The Barossa Council area.

3.3 Minister’s Policies

3.3.1 Planning Policy Library

The Barossa Council Development Plan was converted to the South Australian Planning Policy Library modules via the Better Development Plan and General DPA on 18 August 2011.

Based on the substantial investigations undertaken to date, Council anticipates it will need to introduce local additions or variation to the Planning Policy Library, and to update existing policies to the current policy library version where appropriate and necessary. Where this form of policy amendment is considered necessary, justification will be provided in the DPA.

3.3.2 Existing Ministerial Policies (Section 25(5), 26 and Section 29)

Any amendment to policies introduced through section 25(5), 26 or 29 of the Act will be justified in the DPA and Council confirms that the policies will only be changed in a way that ensures consistency with the Planning Strategy.

3.3.3 Ministerial DPAs

As at 26 September 2014 there were no Ministerial DPAs initiated, on public consultation or pending decisions, considered of relevance to this DPA.
4. Investigations and Consultation

4.1 Investigations

4.1.1 Investigations Previously Undertaken

Investigations previously undertaken (prior to the preparation of this SOI) that will inform this DPA include the following:

- Review of various strategic and planning documents including:
  - The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (February 2010)
  - Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act 2012 (enacted 18 January 2013)
  - Barossa Character Values – Community Engagement Report (February 2013)
  - Addendum to two volumes of the South Australian Planning Strategy: 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and Murray and Mallee Region Plan: Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale Character Preservation (December 2013)
  - The Barossa Council Strategic Directions Report (December 2013)

- Input from a Working Group which resulted in the formulation of a number of key policy questions

- Submissions from community engagement on the recommended options (July 2014)

- Rural Areas and Character Review 2014 by Council, URS and URPS.

4.1.2 Investigations Initiated to Inform this DPA

The detailed investigations already undertaken in preparing the above Rural Areas and Character Review 2014 will comprise the bulk of the investigations for this DPA. Additional investigations (including those arising from issues not addressed in the Planning Policy Modules) to inform this DPA will be primarily limited to those necessary to confirm or finalise the detailed policy positions, but will also confirm and/or expand on the work undertaken for the Rural Areas and Character Review 2014 as follows:

Landscape character

1. Review Rural Landscape Protection Zone policies to ensure:
   - Appropriate protection of the Barossa Range as a natural backdrop setting and contrast to the Barossa Valley Floor
   - Greater emphasis is given to the appearance of buildings in the landscape through more specific control of external colours and materials, building height and massing, fencing and driveways
   - Siting and design criteria for dwellings are consistent with those in the Primary Production Zone.
2. Review the boundary of the Rural Landscape Protection Zone to ensure it adequately covers the western escarpment of the Barossa Range from near Williamstown to near Stockwell.

3. Review the Desired Character Statements of each rural zone to consistently reinforce the need to protect:
   - Natural and rural character and scenic features
   - Areas of recognised biodiversity and conservation value including areas of intact native vegetation
   - Views from designated tourist routes from inappropriate built development.

4. Review the General Section policies in order to:
   - Ensure sufficient emphasis is given to utilising indigenous species and revegetation/rehabilitation, where appropriate (with inclusion of preferred species list as recommended by local NRM Boards)
   - Consider the need for landscaping and Landscape Management Plans as part of a development application
   - Ensure appropriate landscape buffers are provided adjacent to Conservation Parks or areas of high biodiversity value.

5. Consider identification of panoramic views from lookouts (identified in the Planning Strategy Addendum) and inclusion of policies to protect these from intrusive development that would adversely impact enjoyment of views (focussing on the ‘fore’ views incorporating land within close proximity to the primary viewpoint).

6. Review the merits or otherwise of including the Kaiserstuhl, Hale, Sandy Creek and Warren conservation parks, Para Wirra Recreation Park and other conservation areas in the Conservation Zone.

Building siting and design

1. Review policies in the General Section to more clearly reflect the values and policies contained in the Planning Strategy Addendum including the Design and Appearance, Land Division, Siting and Visibility and Residential Development modules. The review will investigate the potential use of diagrams to articulate design intent.

2. Consider more specific siting and design policies for buildings in all rural zones to reflect the policies of the Planning Strategy Addendum including the merits of having more detailed and consistent size, siting and design policies for dwellings in particular, using the existing Primary Production Zone policies as a starting point.

3. Review existing non-complying criteria for dwellings in the Primary Production Zone to focus on achieving good design outcomes such as building height and earthworks, with a view for criteria such as window size, orientation, and roof pitch being addressed by design policies rather than non-complying triggers.

4. Consider new siting and design criteria for farm and horticultural buildings across all four zones, including the potential to apply different policies within each zone or area, for
different land uses or within a prescribed distance of a public road depending on the landscape.

5. Consider more prescriptive criteria for new dwellings and associated private open space areas including swimming pool criteria.

**Interface and buffer management**

1. Review interface and buffer policies to provide an appropriate level of protection for:
   - ‘existing’ (sensitive) residential / tourism land uses (located in primary production or urban zones) where an agricultural land use is proposed.
   - ‘existing’ primary production land uses where a residential / tourist accommodation is proposed.

This review may require updating General section interface policies and relevant zone Desired Character statements. The review will assess the concept of managing and/or minimising impacts, as opposed to completely halting impacts.

2. Consider policies that require new development which is proposed to be introduced adjacent to a primary production and/or residential land use to provide an appropriate buffer.

3. Consider new policies with regards to rural to rural interface issues that promote the need for an appropriate vegetated buffer having regard to local circumstances, in addition the potential to list new farming / horticulture land uses as a form of development requiring consultation with neighbouring land owners.

**Primary production diversification and value adding**

1. Consider if small scale processing, packing, storage and sales (or combination thereof) activities could be assessed on their merits subject to scale, location and the like.

2. Review Desired Character statements of each rural zone to consistently contemplate development involving small scale processing, packing, storage and sales that has a low impact on the landscape and the operations of primary production.

3. Review polices of each rural zone to ensure development involving small scale processing, packing, storage and sales can achieve specific performance standards in relation to built form and visual impact, traffic and car parking, and impact on infrastructure.

4. Review policies which currently restrict intensive rural industries within parts of the Primary Production Zone.

5. Consider if policies in each rural zone should more clearly define envisaged and not envisaged forms of development.

**Wineries and ancillary development**

1. Consider if a cellar door, shop, restaurant or combination thereof could be assessed on their merits subject to scale, location and the like.
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2. Review Desired Character statements of each rural zone to contemplate development of small scale cellar doors, shops and restaurant associated with vineyards and wineries that have a low impact on the landscape and operations of primary production.

3. Review polices of each rural zone to ensure cellar doors, shops and restaurants can achieve specific performance standards in relation to built form and visual impact, traffic and car parking, and impact on infrastructure.

4. Review classification of outbuildings, verandas and storage tanks in the Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone and Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone to allow minor ancillary development associated with primary production and wineries to be assessed on merit.

5. Review notification categories in each rural zone relating to minor ancillary development associated with primary production and wineries.

Tourism development in rural areas

1. Consider if tourist accommodation could be assessed on its merits where subject to scale, location and the like.

2. Review Desired Character statements of each rural zone to contemplate small scale tourist accommodation, ancillary to primary production uses, that has low impacts on the landscape and operations of existing primary production.

3. Review polices of each rural zone to ensure small scale tourist accommodation can achieve specific performance standards in relation to built form and visual impact, traffic and car parking, and impact on infrastructure.

Land division, creation of new allotments and boundary alignments

1. Review the policy which provides for additional allotments to be created in the Primary Production Zone: Precinct 5 Concordia.

2. Consider policies which restrict the potential for boundary realignments which increase the number of small allotments which could accommodate a potential dwelling.

3. Consider policies which envisage a smaller allotment around a dwelling which existed on the [approval date] subject to the dwelling being adequately separated from side boundaries and adjacent primary production activities.

4. Consider extending the limitation on increasing the number of allotments less than 32 ha existing in the Primary Production Zone to the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone.

5. Consider if proposals to realign very small and unusable lots such as lots comprising a former closed road should be non-complying.
New dwellings in rural areas

1. Review policies relating to merit and non-complying criteria for dwellings across the four rural zones with any dwelling yield potential increases identified and justified in terms of impacts on primarily production viability and impacts on landscape character in the context of the Planning Strategy Addendum.

2. Consider if a dwelling on a lot below 0.5 ha should be non-complying due to potential wastewater management issues with the exception of allotments in Table Baro/3 Infill Dwelling Sites and identified on Concept Plan Map Baro/10 - Kroemer Crossing.

3. Consider if Dependent Accommodation consistent with the policies in the General Section: Residential Development could be considered on its merits in the rural zones except the Rural Landscape Protection Zone.

4. Review policies relating to the amalgamation of land involving three or more allotments in the Primary Production Zone: Barossa Range precinct and Moculta precinct and Rural Landscape Protection Zone.

5. Consider if the policy in the Concordia precinct which states that a dwelling should only occur on an allotment greater than 32 hectares in area should apply to the balance of the Primary Production Zone and to the Watershed Protection (Mount Lofty Ranges) Zone.

6. Review the level of justification required to be provided by applicants for dwellings in rural areas.

7. Review public notification policies for new dwellings in the Primary Production Zone, Primary Production (Barossa Valley Region) Zone, Rural Landscape Protection Zone and Watershed Zone.

Other issues

1. Review the existing rural zone and precinct structure.

2. Review the Primary Production Priority Areas identified by PIRSA. These investigations will include consideration (including ground-truthing if necessary) of the designated areas and their potential to further complement the Character Preservation policies and ensure the key areas of primary production are appropriately protected with a suitable suite of Development Plan policies.

3. Address minor anomalies throughout the Development Plan.

4. Review zone boundaries to address known anomalies and errors.

5. Review non-complying lists to ensure they are better aligned to the desired character and supporting planning policies of each zone, to improve clarity, to reduce confusion and to achieve clearer planning outcomes.

6. Review public notification categories to ensure they are better aligned to the desired character and supporting planning policies of each zone.
4.2 Consultation

The following agencies, State Members of Parliament, interested parties and Councils will be consulted during the consultation stage of the DPA:

- Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources – Planning and Assessment Team
- Department for Health and Ageing – Wastewater Management
- Department of Justice – Country Fire Service Development Assessment Unit (Bushfire Protection)
- Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure – Statutory Planning and Transport Services
- Department of Primary Industries and Regions – Land Use and Planning
- Environment Protection Authority
- South Australian Tourism Commission
- SA Power Networks
- SA Water
- Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM
- Mr Stephan Knoll MP, State Member for Schubert
- Mr Mark Goldsworthy MP, State Member for Kavel
- Mr Tony Piccolo MP, State Member for Light
- Mr Nick Champion, Federal Member for Wakefield
- Mr Tony Pasin, Federal Member for Barker
- Mr Jamie Briggs, Federal Member for Mayo
- Working Group members
- Town of Gawler
- Light Regional Council
- Playford Council
- Adelaide Hills Council
- Mid Murray Council.

Consultation with the public will be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the Act and Regulations. This will include:

- A notice in the Government Gazette.
- A notice in the Herald, Leader and Bunyip newspapers.
The scheduling of a Public Meeting at which any interested person may appear to make representations on the proposed amendment.

5. Proposed DPA Process

5.1 DPA Process

Council intends to undertake the following DPA process (check box):

- Process B1 (with consultation approval)

A copy of the DPA will be sent to the Minister for approval to release it for concurrent agency and public consultation (not more than 8 weeks for agency comment and not less than 8 weeks for public comment).

5.1.1 Rationale

Council is aware that a number of other councils within the Greater Adelaide region are undertaking rural policy reviews. Council is also aware that the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is working with those other councils to ensure a consistent policy framework for Primary Production and Watershed Protection zones is established followed. Process B1 (with consultation approval) will enable the Department to confirm that proposed policy changes within the draft DPA for consultation DPA is consistent with the other DPAs being undertaken and in line with the investigations being undertaken across the region.

5.2 Interim Operation

N/A.
6. Professional Advice and Document Production

6.1 Professional Advice

The professional advice required will be provided by:

- Paul Mickan.

This person satisfies the professional advice requirements of the Act and Regulations and will provide advice to the council prior to the preparation of the DPA. This person is not considered to have a conflict of interest or perceived conflict on interest in the DPA.

6.2 Document Production

The DPA (including the structure, amendment instructions and mapping) will be prepared in accordance with the Technical Guide to Development Plan Amendments issued by the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (the Department) and any templates, except as mutually agreed.

To ensure certainty as to the correct version of the DPA, the DPA will contain a date in the footer (e.g. version 5 July 2007). The footer will be located on every page of the DPA, including the proposed amendments (including mapping).

The Chief Executive Officer of the council will ensure that the policies implement the Planning Strategy, all procedures have been completed within the statutory requirements, and that mapping is correct prior to issuing a certificate in accordance with the Act. If this is not the case, the council will take responsibility for the DPA until the matter has been resolved.

6.3 Mapping

Council will obtain electronic copies of all the affected maps and/or figures from the Department prior to the commencement of mapping amendments to ensure all mapping is amended based on current map bases.

Amendments to maps will be provided in the required format to the Planning Division of the Department. Mapping amendments for this DPA will be undertaken by:

- Mike Lannan from URPS.
## 7. Proposed DPA Timetable

### Process B2 (with consultation approval) Timetable

The following timetable is proposed for this DPA based on the selected process. Council will take steps to update this timetable if it appears at any stage that Council will require an extension to complete a task.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Agreed Timeframe from Minister’s Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Plan Amendment (DPA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations conducted; DPA prepared and sent to the Department requesting agreement to commence public and agency consultation</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>16 weeks SOI agreement – DPA lodged with the Department for consultation approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA assessed and report prepared for Minister</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and agency consultation approved by Minister</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA prepared for public consultation</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>4 weeks Public consultation approved - public consultation commences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and agency consultation concludes</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Consultation and Proposed Amendment (SCPA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting held; submissions summarised; DPA amended in accordance with Council’s assessment of submissions; SCPA prepared and lodged with the Department</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>8 weeks Public consultation closes – SCPA lodged with the Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPA assessed and report on DPA prepared for Minister</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister considers report on DPA and makes decision</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved amendment gazetted</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Ministerial approval of the proposed amendment, it is forwarded to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of Parliament for review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Agreed Timeframe from Minister’s Approval</th>
<th>Dates (based on 28/7/15 agreement)</th>
<th>Actual/likely date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement of Intent (SOI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft SOI endorsed by Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOI submitted to Minister for endorsement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting at DPTI to discuss SOI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal DPTI comments on SOI received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Council response to DPTI comments provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft revised SOI submitted to DPTI for review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal DPTI comments on draft revised SOI received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised SOI submitted to Minister for endorsement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOI agreement by Minister</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update report to SPDPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Plan Amendment (DPA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigations conducted; DPA prepared and sent to the Department requesting agreement to commence public and agency consultation</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>16 weeks SOI agreement – DPA lodged with the Department for consultation approval</td>
<td>17 November 2015</td>
<td>17 November 2015: present draft DPA to Council meeting or special SPDPC meeting to endorse to lodge for consultation approval 1 December 2015: Submit DPA to Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA assessed and report prepared for Minister</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>5 January 2016</td>
<td>19 January 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and agency consultation approved by Minister</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>2 February 2016</td>
<td>16 February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPA prepared for public consultation</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>4 weeks Public consultation approved - public consultation commences</td>
<td>1 March 2016</td>
<td>15 March 2016: present final draft DPA to SPDPC to endorse for consultation Consultation period: Thu 17 March - Fri 13 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and agency consultation concludes</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>26 April 2016</td>
<td>13 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Consultation and Proposed Amendment (SCPA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting held; submissions summarised; DPA amended in accordance with Council’s assessment of submissions; SCPA prepared and lodged with the Department</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>8 weeks Public consultation closes – SCPA lodged with the Department</td>
<td>21 June 2016</td>
<td>Public meeting: During week 30 May - 3 June 2016 Submissions reviewed: 16 May - 3 June 2016 21 June 2016: Response to submissions, recommended changes, draft SCPA presented to SPDPC 8 July 2016: SCPA lodged with DPTI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPA assessed and report on DPA prepared for Minister</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>7 weeks</td>
<td>9 August 2016</td>
<td>26 August 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister considers report on DPA and makes decision</td>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>6 September 2016</td>
<td>23 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved amendment gazetted</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>20 September 2016</td>
<td>Thu 13 October 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>