



Mt Barker & District Residents' Association Inc  
PO Box 494 Mount Barker, South Australia 5251

*For the Community*

# Submission to the District Council of Mt Barker's Development Plan Review

January 2011

## INDEX

1. Introduction	3
2. Population increase	9
3. Sustainability	11
4. Infill versus urban sprawl	12
5. Infrastructure	15
6. Transport	17
7. Employment	20
8. Primary Production and Food Security	22
9. Environmental including Biodiversity	26
10. Water	27
11. Health and Community Services	29
12. Community Development	33
13. Conclusion	36
References	37
Review of Council wide Objectives	39

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Mt Barker and District Residents' Association (The Association) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Council's Development Plan Review (DP Review), being developed in response to the State Government's 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (The Plan). It commends Council for taking a proactive, strategic approach to planning for the future of the Mt Barker District. Clearly considerable research has been undertaken and Council's Planning staff are to be commended for this significant volume of work in relation to the two discussion papers linked to urban and rural issues. We also commend the commissioning of the Harding, Hughes and James report (July 2009) which is included in the Council's consultation documents.

### **The 30 Year Plan**

After having studied The Plan with great care, consulting our members and preparing a submission to the State Government, we believe there are several key principles which underpin The Plan, together with draft strategies and targets, which are not consistent throughout the document. These strategies are often in conflict with leading academic schools of thought, some illogical and, as a result, extremely alarming. We aim to focus on those in this submission to Council, and, where possible link these to the Council's two discussion papers on urban and rural issues.

We believe careful analysis of the statistical data underpinning The Plan was required to ensure the modelling is reliable and valid. Hence the research undertaken by Council staff, as well as the comprehensive investigative studies commissioned by Council in response to the Ministerial Development Plan Amendment (MDPA) should provide a solid foundation from which to form future guiding strategies and actions.

The Association will address its concerns using The Plan's key guiding principles (p14).

### **Scale and Scope**

The Minister has indicated that the community in this District is anti-development. It certainly is not anti-development as evidenced by the recent growth and development in the District. It is the fastest growing town in Australia with a population growth of 2.7% per annum (Cega and Econsearch, 2010). Much of this development was initiated by the local Council in a staged, managed Development Plan Amendment (DPA) in 2006/07 where the majority of infrastructure costs were to be, and have been funded by developers. In fact, development has been occurring regularly since 1996 when the first major subdivision was established in the District with the establishment of the Martindale development.

It is the size, scale and uncontrolled manner of this MDPA which is of concern to the community. It will effectively double the population in a very short space of time, without appropriate infrastructure and services support. The Council's concerns about lack of infrastructure are predicated on the fact that the current development infrastructure is significantly lagging despite the developer's contributions. As one resident noted recently, *'Our suburb was the first to be subdivided in 1875 and we still haven't got footpaths'*. In Council's agenda papers of 2 August, 2010 it notes: *'Pre the MDPA, Council was already under*

*some stress (financial and staff resourcing) as can be evidenced by its struggle to cope with the current infrastructure demands to accommodate its historic high population growth' (p12).*

The scale of the development is so great that it is not just 'an amendment' - it is a whole new town of up to 30,000 people. The existing town - streets, car parks and services - are not set up for being swamped in this way and will be unworkable. Ludicrously, the MDPA says there will not be any impact on the town centre because the new 'neighbourhood' zoning will allow for some retail/services throughout the growth areas. However, a close reading of the MDPA says this will only happen if developers want it to! There is no certainty within this document about managing growth and expansion. There is no indication of a staged approach. And the time line has been reduced from 30 years to 15 years without any further explanation.

It is important to note that the Urban Overview map on p 5 of Council's Urban Discussion paper is now no longer relevant with the approval of the MDPA. This should be replaced with an updated map.

#### **A balanced scorecard**

We emphasise the need to take a **triple bottom line approach** to planning and development in this District. The Plan, in the main, takes a housing and development centric approach, based on the premise that the population must increase. We question this premise. The Plan addresses many material aspects (land use, housing) but it has not addressed intangibles well enough to provide a 'balanced scorecard' (impact on culture of region; integration of people into the district; social services). There is a need to recognise that the qualitative issues are often more important than the quantitative issues. We acknowledge the two papers prepared by Council staff, as well as Council's own submission to The Plan attempt to address these issues in a far more tangible manner.

Some fundamental questions about the information in The Plan will be raised throughout our response. It is clear in The Plan, and the correspondence from the Minister to our Council, that the developers have had first contact with the Government before the Council has been able to discuss or negotiate anything around the land use and town boundary. The recent approval of the MDPA highlights Council's lack of firm footing in these initial consultations. It is hoped that this review will provide Council with a substantial policy document which will guide all future developments in our District.

#### **Developer influence**

The influence of the Mount Barker Consortium, in conjunction with Connor Holmes, on the Minister is a key issue which destabilises the MDPA. The Consortium is directing the planning of the District without input from the Council or the community. This is wrong! It is undemocratic, is collusive in nature and defies the Government's stance of being open and honest to its community. It is also, we believe, a serious conflict of interest. We support Council if it chooses to undertake a judicial approach similar to that which the Gawler Council has now undertaken. We also suggest that developer influence is not as important as community influence.

#### **Key principles**

The Association supports the development of the twelve key principles as the foundation for The Plan. Our response to this review has been structured under each of the Council's

discussion paper topics. Where appropriate we have included commentary on the issues and strategies identified in those two papers.

## Principles of the Plan

1. A compact & carbon efficient city
2. Housing diversity & choice
3. Accessibility
4. Transit-focused & connected
5. World-class design & vibrancy
6. Social inclusion & fairness
7. Heritage & character protection & enhancement
8. Healthy, safe & connected communities
9. Affordable living
10. Economic growth & competitiveness
11. Climate change & resilience
12. Environmental protection, restoration & enhancement
13. Natural resources mgt
14. Community engagement

### Public Consultation

We refer you to two quotes by Minister Holloway in recent weeks which are of extreme concern to this community:

*'We can't allow the future growth of our State to be impeded by individual Councils who just think, well look, just shut the door.'* - ABC Ch2 7pm News 22 June, 2010 and

*'We've developed the 30 Year Plan on the basis that this is a sustainable level of growth and that's why we don't believe there's any need for any revision.'* - ABC Ch2 7pm News 25 July 2010.

These two comments indicate the arrogance of the Minister in treating both Council's and our community's responses as irrelevant, unnecessary, and worse, to be ignored as part of this process. Council was forced to fund consultants (at a cost of \$100,000) in order to hold six information sessions, prepare substantial and heavily researched investigation reports as well as a 500 resident survey to determine feedback to the MDPA. The Government has done nothing to support community engagement by informing its citizens about this plan. It has neither the courage nor the foresight to know that an engaged and supportive community would make this process a much more valued one than is currently the case.

We truly hope that Council does not make this same mistake. We believe a truly informed community; actively participating in decision making is a best practice community engagement model. It is encouraging to see the level, quality and length of consultation provided to the community for this review, the Better Development Plan review and the Town Centre Review. We strongly support Council's actions for these three major projects and look forward to participating in the next stage of strategy and policy development.

### **Inconsistency of the MDPA with the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide**

To ensure Council is aware of the Association's concerns that the MDPA differs from The Plan we have included a summary of the key differences below:

- The Plan was supposed to be the strategic plan for Adelaide's future development. How can the MDPA differ from it? Is there not a legislative requirement to use the MDPA to address the Plan's targets?
- There are serious discrepancies between The Plan and the MDPA re population numbers. The Plan indicated 15,600 new people to the region, but the MDPA indicates 30,212 people.
- Also, the MDPA, which completely ignores The Plan's numbers, states up to 30,212 new people are coming to Mount Barker over 15 years not 30. This growth is 97% which, averaged over the 15 years is 6.5% pa, five times the 1.4% growth the Minister asserts.
- The Plan (p 91) shows the total SA 30 year growth population of 560,000 spread over the regions, with the Hills portion of this projected at 29,000: Murray Bridge to have 13,400 new residents and Mount Barker to have 15,600. The Plan, and therefore 15,600, is an official and adopted part of SA's planning rules. Therefore, 15,600 is the population increase for 30 years, so the MDPA is completely incorrect in stating up to 30,212 new residents in 15 years.
- The housing projections are inconsistent with The Plan - 11,487 in the MDPA, compared to 7,000 in The Plan.
- There are significant variations to the town boundaries shown in the MDPA, in comparison to The Plan; again we question the legitimacy of this variation. These have been adjusted without consultation or explanation. Is it due to either land owners not wishing to sell, or developers influencing the Minister and Planning Dept?
- The Plan includes TODS in its plans; this MDPA does not mention them.
- The Plan aimed to support the preservation of character and rural production but these have not been honoured.
- The Plan had 280 hectares of land for employment (p 105 map D10). This has disappeared in the MDPA. There is only mention of 41 hectares of new light industrial land which is certainly not going to generate the 13,000 jobs in The Plan for the whole Hills region.

We believe these inconsistencies require attention prior to any further policy development by Council, particularly if Council is developing policy and strategy around The Plan. These policies will, in some cases, not match the MDPA thereby creating discrepancies for Council in the future.

We note Part 1 – Application of the Plan in Council's Urban Issues paper. We note the expectation that boundaries will be established for Mt Barker and other towns within the

District until 2038. We question whether the establishment of such a boundary is possible or likely to succeed and be retained. The Minister has indicated, by way of approval of his MDPA that he cares nought for the current urban boundary, created in 2006. Nor does he care about the orderly development process that Council was undertaking with the approval of the Residential PAR (2007) and its implementation over a number of years, by way of a staged, orderly approach.

The Plan indicates that for Years 16 to 30 there will be no further expansion of the town's boundary. However we do not believe this statement. We think Council should attempt, with all of its power to retain the current boundary, and oppose the current new MDPA boundary. There is no clear indication of how lands can be protected from future developer deals.

If other towns such as Macclesfield, Meadows, Nairne, Hahndorf and Echunga are to be expanded further, those towns, and the District will lose forever the aspects and ambience that make them special and unique to South Australia. The Adelaide Hills should be 'out of bounds' to developers and the government for further expansion and urban sprawl - forever.

#### **Risk to Council and ratepayers**

The MDPA in its current form creates high level of risks for the Council. Sound financial management has been a key cornerstone of this Council. This MDPA puts this financial framework at significant risk as there is insufficient capital (cash reserves or loan facilities) to fund such a large scale development, particularly as there is no indication that the current developer contribution policy will be continued. The Council states '*The fiscal magnitude of the MDPA and its long term duration, the consequent potential changes in Government(s) and the long term financial viability of the developers involved collectively contribute to a process involving significant risk to Council.*' (Council Agenda papers, 2 August 2010, p13).

Further in the same agenda papers '*Council's discussions with experienced financial business consultants to South Australian local government support the view that Council's involvement in the MDPA may well severely challenge its future financial sustainability and while acknowledging the issues requires a more detailed review, as it poses substantial long term viability risks to the Council*' (op cit, p12).

Further risks identified by Council include: loss of community goodwill and engagement; inadequate supply of land for social infrastructure (60 hectares as a minimum requirement); inadequate employment prospects or opportunities for such a large increase in population; inadequate and unsafe roads creating greater risk for accident and injury to its citizens; environmental and health risks; risks to its sustainability objectives particularly in relation to its waste water and storm water management (op cit, pp 3 – 7).

#### **Council Discussion paper – Urban Issues**

We concur with Council in its first section of the Urban Issues Discussion paper (pp13 – 15).

With regards to Item 5: Summary of Issues:

- Issue 5.1: we question whether the urban lands boundaries are exactly the same in The Plan as they are in the MDPA and whether Council will be required to accept the MDPA boundaries, thus making this strategy redundant.
- Issue 5.2: Agree but question whether it is possible to implement any mechanisms to stop an authoritative government from taking control.

- Issue 5.3: Agree that the Plan's principles and objectives should be utilised in strategic planning for the peri-urban area.
- Issue 5.4: Agree that the MB DP should include a staging plan. This is an essential component to accommodate orderly and financially responsible planning.

*Attachment 1: Review of Council wide Objectives* has been included to assist with the development of appropriate objectives in the new Development Plan.



## 2. POPULATION INCREASE

The Plan is based almost solely on a single premise – that population must increase and that this increase is required to ensure ongoing future economic development for this state. Yet this position is never justified in the document. We consider that it would be in the interests of the Government, with elections approaching and the general belief that the process is being driven by developers' interests rather than the common good, for the Minister to present the facts and statistics about the likely and desirable future population of the State.

The premise seems to be extremely flawed. Professor Graham Hugo (2008), a leading academic finds fault in the hypothesis. This Association, having heard a recent presentation by the Professor, thus seeks statistical justification for the Government's position on population growth. We understand that the Population Advisory Group has not met for two years so where have the statistics to justify an increase in our population come from? If Prof Hugo believes the figures are '*plucked from the air*' where does the government source the half million figure from?

We also understand that these figures are based on 2001, not 2006 Census figures. Our District has had an average of 3% growth per year and our community and Council has serious difficulty dealing with that growth due to serious infrastructure and other constraints. This Plan now suggests between 10 – 12% growth per annum. This is nonsensical without the appropriate infrastructure and services to support such growth.

The birth rate (ABS, 2006) is well below replacement level. With current immigration we are far above replacement level. Prof Hugo (2008) shows how these have been used by the state of South Australia to more than treble its immigrant intake as part of its economic development strategy. Hugo (op cit) now claims immigrant intake has almost quadrupled! The Government does not appear to have considered the effects of an additional half a million people on our social structure. We need hard evidence that consideration has occurred before allowing such a considerable influx of people trained overseas. There is no need to panic. The 'baby boomer' cohort will pass through anyway. The tens of thousands of middle aged immigrants already here will only delay and extend the effect of that bubble.

Clive Hamilton (2003) describes economic growth as pathological and says the obsession with economic growth for its own sake is merely '*growth fetishism*'. '*Economic growth does not create happiness, unhappiness sustains economic growth*' (Hamilton, 2003, p220). If growth was a reliable measure of wealth, India would rule the world! The fact that this is not so, gives just cause to question the real costs of growth.

Globally there is sufficient evidence that indicates population increase does not automatically equate to economic growth and/or prosperity. In fact there is worldwide evidence to the contrary, hence China and India attempts to now curb growth. Why also do we advise developing countries they must reduce population growth? The United States is now trying to slow their two million per annum increase with government led programs. Switzerland and Scandinavia have high prosperity but no population growth (Hugo, 2009). Some countries have a deliberate 'no growth' policy (Germany) and are moving towards higher quality

living/production and a steady-state economy. We believe such a strategy is more appropriate for the Greater Adelaide region and the Mt Barker District in particular.

Lawn (2008) found that South Australia was at its most prosperous in a long period of relatively low growth and Lawn and Clarke (2006) found that the GDP was a false measure of welfare since it did not count the cost of non-renewable resource depletion. It also did not differentiate between economic activity generated in war or peace, community effort or natural disasters. In applying the Genuine Progress Indicator they found growth to have long term negative consequences not captured in short term economic data.

#### **Council Discussion paper – Urban Issues**

We agree with Council's statements in Section 1: 1.1 through to 1.5 and support the adoption of a framework which effectively addresses the issues raised by Council and our association in order to build a 'socially, economically and environmentally sustainable community' (DCMB, Urban Issues Discussion paper, p9).

At Part 13 Demographics there is substantial discussion and statistical evidence indicating an ageing population for the district. This needs to be taken into account for all planning, whether it be for housing, shopping, transport and community services. Areas need to be developed for more retirement and aged care living options. There should be a phased approach for retirees to move from independent living to a nursing home. The option at Riverbank, Mt Barker is one example of sensible senior citizens, independent living. Having choices is important for senior citizens. Council should adopt planning strategies that can support those choices.

We agree with the issues and strategies listed on pp 61 – 62.

#### **Council Discussion paper – Rural Issues**

We note the comprehensive section on Demographics in this paper. The issues and strategies listed at Item 11 include several that are linked to other areas, namely 11.4; 11.5; 11.6, 11.7 and 11.9. We suggest that where appropriate strategies are cross referenced to ensure they are captured at the appropriate discussion point.

We support the issues and strategies listed and in particular Item 11.8 which would provide significant benefits to our community.

We do not support a rate reduction or rebate for residents in rural areas who connect to the internet. Low socio-economic citizens could also be supported, as a number of other affected user groups. Thus it would be unfair to provide a financial reward to one community group without consideration of all others.

### 3. SUSTAINABILITY

The Ministerial Mount Barker Growth MDPA is essentially a nineteenth-century concept of the kind that spawned the growth of suburbia in our cities – the unhappy results of which our cities are still dealing with. South Australia will miss a unique opportunity to develop town-planning initiatives that would position it as a world leader in social/urban development if it implements this plan in its current form.

World population and design opinion has moved away from suburban sprawl as a viable means of housing people. Particularly now, in a world that is threatened by scarcity of water, food and energy resources and one in which pollution is a major threat to human life on the planet. Alienation of productive land for housing is nothing less than national suicide.

The current plan is ecologically and socially untenable. It is completely understandable that the plan is supported by the developers and the real estate industry because its operatives stand to gain considerably from its implementation,<sup>1</sup> but the Government's priority should be the benefit of the whole community, both now and, especially in the future.

The population increase proposed and expected is of such a magnitude that this review of the Mount Barker Development Plan should take into account issues such as:

- the decline of food production in the world (Cribb, 2010) and in eastern states in particular;
- the apparent issue that Victoria last year imported food for the first time in its history;
- the fact that Coles in Mount Barker buys its bacon from Canada (Mount Barker used to supply bacon to the nation);
- the fact that foreign nations (USA, China, Q'tar) are buying up Australian agriculture resources to supply their own future needs – not ours (ABC National);
- the Federal Government's sustainable population policy;
- the findings of the Senate Select Committee on food security;
- the need to include women's needs in neighbourhood design (Watson, 2010);
- The Murray-Darling Basin Commission and the Wentworth Group report that the Murray-Darling Basin will receive 50% less water in the future; and
- criticisms of the 30-year Plan printed in Smart Farmer on 1 July, 2010, and in The Advertiser of the published views of eminent people like Ken Henry, David Chalke, Ralph Clarke, Ziggy Switkowski, Dick Smith, Tim Jackson and Kevin O'Leary and the Waite Institute and Deakin University.

It would also be wise not to proceed until the Federal Government has enunciated its *New Cities Strategy*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Although it should be noted that agents who are not directly involved in the development believe that their incomes will be reduced due to deflation of resale prices of homes that are currently in existence (see *The Courier*, 28 July, 2010).

#### 4. INFILL versus URBAN SPRAWL

The Plan proposed, and the MDPA approved the radical extension of the town boundaries, which will now result in extensive urban sprawl. But we question where this will stop? We support the policy of infill development rather than green fill and on this issue we support Council's stance. The existing urban boundary can contain many more households and people and during the Residential PAR consultations and planning from 2003 – 2007 this policy of infill of existing boundaries was established. But The Plan and MDPA have approved a massive oversupply of land to cater for the Government's own planning targets. We question the logic of this. We believe that a sounder approach would be for the town to grow up rather than out.

It is anticipated in The Plan that Mt Barker growth will increase by almost double within 15 years, rather than the 30 years promoted by The Plan. Why halve the development time when the rest of the State is considered within a thirty year timeframe? We suspect that this may be simply Phase 1 of a further urban expansion plan that the Minister is yet to inform the community about. We believe this is unsustainable urban expansion by stealth. How undemocratic can this Government become in such a short time frame?

We acknowledge the strategies in Council's two discussion papers that no further expansion be allowed after Year 15. We have serious concerns that Council will have any say over this and hope that the new Development Plan can provide some safeguards to prevent further urban sprawl. There must be some way the town boundaries can be well and truly fixed. Council must find that way.

We commend Council on expending considerable resources during the Plan's consultation period to determine whether The Plan is truly viable. It tested the assumptions in great detail. Eight staff from three departments worked full time on the Council's response and we accepted that this was an indication that Council was seriously concerned about The Plan.

We support Council's stance that this Plan is flawed in many areas, particularly around statistical evidence for land use, loss of agricultural lands and lack of infrastructure funding and support. Thus if this Review can incorporate policies and strategies into the Development Plan and the Strategic Directions report which will counteract these flaws, we support it fully.

The Council's response showed quite clearly that the Government has over-calculated growth lands and underestimated resources and funding availability in this community.

##### **Council Discussion Paper – Urban Issues**

In Section 2 - Urban Expansion and Population Growth of the Council's Urban Issues Discussion paper we again agree with the Planning unit's assessment of these issues. In Item 2 'Growth Areas' we note that there was a 2009 study (GIS based investigation) undertaken by the DC of Mt Barker but this is not referenced. It would be helpful to know the title of that study.

In Item 3 – Transit Oriented Development, we find minimal discussion about this important topic. We suggest that light rail assessment be included in any consideration of TODs.

In Item 4 – Rural Living Policy, you note that these zones remain an inefficient use of land and cause interface problems. We are not sure what these interface problems are as it seems like a logical zone to move from urban to peri-urban and then to rural. A phased approach to the number of houses per hectare would seem sensible in ensuring appropriate buffer zones. However, perhaps we are inexperienced in these matters of zoning, and we are certainly not planning experts!

We also question whether the residents of these zones, in particular Martindale, Waterford and Dalmeny Park would appreciate further intensification of their living areas. Most have paid a premium for these size blocks and purchased them for particular reasons, including having a rural feel in a regional centre. Infill in these areas would lose that ambience and way of life.

In Item 5 – transmission line we note the issues around the width of the corridor. We would propose the corridor be as wide as is necessary to ensure the health and safety for any residents living or travelling in the vicinity of these lines. We also strongly oppose the notion that the land within these corridors is included in the 12.5% or more of open space requirement. These corridors are not appropriate for housing or reserves but useful to ensure linked corridors for wildlife and native species.

We also strongly oppose the urban expansion proposed in the MDPA around this transmission line. We strongly urge Council to seek national and international research which supports the Council's stance not to develop in these areas because of health and safety risks to the community. We agree and support all seven strategies listed to address issues in this section

In Part 8 – Urban Design we again support the principles about appropriate and sustainable housing design. Council has shown some leadership in developing guidelines to owner/builders and we suggest these are strengthened further to ensure that all housing and development is sustainable and protective of our environment.

Part 12 – Built Form includes discussion which the Association supports. Heritage and Character (Item 2) are essential to be retained and even with the inclusion of 800 properties on the Local Heritage Register we note the demolition of old buildings throughout the district. There must be a stronger philosophical position, matched by appropriate planning policy that does not allow the destruction of our heritage buildings.

This heritage should be showcased and be part of a tourism drive within the District. We support the strategies listed at Section 3, p49 but note that 3.3 seems to be unfinished or incomplete. Item 3.4 should include something to the effect that no demolition will occur unless there are extreme circumstances eg danger to the community.

Regarding the signage policy for Hahndorf; one exists but it is not enacted therefore is meaningless. As with any policies, without implementation they have no power.

#### **Council Discussion Paper – Rural Issues**

We note the discussion at Part 9 – Ratings.

Strategy 4.2 addressing Residential land uses occurring within the primary production areas requires further consideration as we believe this is a complex area but could be modified to support local generational farming families.

We also note and fully support the discussion at Part 10 – Land Uses. The data about the varying land uses is helpful in understanding how the land and its use contributes to economic reality.

Although we support most of the issues and strategies listed we are somewhat reticent to recommend or support changes to rating policy without further investigation and discussion. In particular this comment relates to Issues 3.2 and Item 3.3 in the discussion paper.

## 5. INFRASTRUCTURE

We understand the MDPA has promised \$550 million of infrastructure funding but there is no clear indication from where these funds will come (other than \$100 million from developers) and to which part of the town they will be applied – new urban developments or existing aging infrastructure.

Waste water management is a critical issue in terms of any future growth planning. The local STEDS system is insufficient for current population and needs extension. How will this be funded for an additional 29,000 residents? The proposed exponential growth of the population gives no recognition of this problem. Much of the underground infrastructure within these three towns was built in the 1970s and is now aging and ready for replacement. How can the Council fund this replacement as well as carry the burden of new systems and structures?

Council's submission to The Plan provides extensive detail on the infrastructure issues. It notes *'The Plan is deficient in articulating infrastructure provision and funding responsibilities, which impacts upon the confidence of delivering sustainable outcomes'* (DCMB, 2009). We concur that infrastructure planning must be included in all Strategic planning but question the availability of adequate funds to sustain a 15 year infrastructure building phase.

It appears that Council has used statistics of an anticipated increase of 12.5 % per annum (cumulative) in the wine industry and a 33% increase in the blue gum trade to justify both the Mt. Barker 'Ring Route' and the new freeway exit from Bald Hills Road (TMP, 2009). Neither of these industry projections seems feasible considering their huge costs.

### **Council Discussion Paper – Urban Issues**

We note the Government's promise of \$550 million for infrastructure but other than the \$100 offered by developers, there is no clear indication when and where this funding is coming from. It also does not indicate whether the second freeway interchange will be built. Thus, although on p21 you note that the MDPA falls silent on infrastructure identification and provision, that statement has now been superseded by later events.

We commend Council on the preparation of their research and supporting reports as noted at p21. The paper notes that Council cannot issue development approvals within the growth areas without the improvement and further development of the waste disposal processes. We support this stance and urge Council to remain firm in their resolve.

We believe the Developer Contribution schedule should be retained although note that the MDPA does not include it in its current Council developed form. Council's current physical infrastructure is overstretched, particularly in the older sections of the town and we believe funds should be set aside to improve physical infrastructure in the older sections first, before any new developments occur.

We support the continued development and implementation of an Infrastructure and Asset Management Plan but note that this is not included as a strategy. We suggest it be included in the strategy list. We support the other four strategies as listed on page 25.

In Part 6 – Regional Centre (p33) we note that Part 1: Role and Function does not include any discussion about the issues. It seems a somewhat incomplete section. Some additional detail about the lack of consistency and why this is an issue needs to be included if this section is to make sense.

Issue 2.1 also appears to be unfinished. We suggest an additional strategy here, which includes linkage to the Town Centre Strategy and the Local Centres Strategy. None of these projects can be seen in isolation as they all affect the role and function of Mt Barker as a Regional Centre.



## 6. TRANSPORT

The Plan calls for the development of TODs which appear, in principle, to be a sensible option for transport management linked to urban development. However, surprisingly, there is no consideration of a TOD for the Mt Barker region. The Plan does not apply its own principles to our region.

TODs are viable for rail (especially fast electric trains) and the most advanced nations in the developed world are now phasing out freeways and reducing motor vehicle dependence (Forster, 2004, 188-189, Newman and Jennings 2009, pp 91, 102, 103-105). In an oil constrained future why build further dependence on roads and highways? We believe there could be a rail service included in The Plan to ensure more efficient and environmentally sustainable transport to and from the city.

We believe the Hills community already has an overreliance on the motor vehicle. Public transport patronage is good but the service is often unreliable with patchy service to outlying areas. Consequently commuters choose to use their own motor vehicles to facilitate their travels. If there is no corresponding increase of public transport service to new outlying areas, they will fast become dormitory suburbs, ideal breeding grounds for disaffected youth and unemployed residents.

In the new proposed urban extensions there is very little commentary made about how these new inhabitants will travel to work, particularly when that work is in the city. There are opportunities in the Hills to develop transit corridors with housing a few metres within transit hubs. We suggest the use of a light rail development in place of the motor vehicle Ring Route suggested by council and noted in The Plan. Not only would a light rail network alleviate the carving up of further agricultural land, but it would also contribute to the reduction of green house gases and carbon emissions.

Traffic to and from the city to the Hills is a serious issue. Currently the South Eastern freeway is extremely busy in peak hours, less so in non peak times. However the main problem lies in the lack of capacity of Glen Osmond Road, and to some extent Cross, Fullarton, Greenhill, Unley and King William Roads, to manage the peak hour traffic to and from the Hills. By increasing the population in the Hills without increasing opportunities for local jobs, the assumption must be held that those residents will travel to the city for work. This is supported by the 2006 Census data. But, once that traffic enters the main Glen Osmond intersection, the delays to the city centre are lengthy and become extremely congested during peak hours.

How is it anticipated that the South Eastern Freeway system will cope in the next 20 years with another 40,000 people trying to get to work on it? In 30 years a potential 50 – 60,000 commuters will be trying to use it if the current plans are implemented. How will it be repaired? Improved? Recent delays when sections were under repair for more than two months necessitated delays of half an hour or more. With increased use these repairs and delays will be more frequent. During these delays access by police and ambulance is almost impossible.

Also consider the serious consequences for bushfire management and township evacuations. A prime example occurred on 27 Sept 2009 when the Freeway was blocked in both directions. A stolen car crashed in the down-lane and the Bay to Birdwood clogged the up-lane. No traffic could pass through. The recent damage to the overpass bridge to Littlehampton and Nairne created significant traffic congestion and problems for several weeks. The deliberate placement of commuters around freeway interchanges is now an outmoded and wasteful process. Why initiate such a system which in enlightened, resilient cities is currently being phased out?

Another issue is the lack of an additional access point to and from the Freeway from the three towns. The Mt Barker Council has argued and lobbied strongly for several years for the need to have an additional interchange on the eastern side of Mt Barker. This is required, in Council's opinion, to provide access to and from the Freeway for Nairne residents, as well as the new inhabitants in the southern and eastern areas and those travelling from Strathalbyn, Milang and Clayton. Mt Barker is a cul de sac in one sense. It only has one entrance and exit for the city bound commuters. It is also a 'through' town for those commuters from Strathalbyn, Milang and even Clayton. Thus not only is the local traffic situation becoming difficult to manage, the additional 'through' traffic is adding to the district's traffic dilemmas.

We understand that \$29 million for an additional ramp to provide access to a few thousand commuters is not the best value of taxpayer's money. We also argue that better transport management planning within and around the towns when the current new developments were approved would have been eminently more sensible. However, the situation is now at such an extreme that an additional exit/entrance onto the freeway is required.

The release of the Council's Transport Master Plan (TMP) does little to alleviate this problem. The TMP suggests an east-west Ring Route be built around the township to cater for this 'through' traffic as well as the traffic created from the current new developments. We believe this strategy is flawed as commuters will always take the shortest most direct route to their destination. The proposed ring route will not provide that direct route.

It was noted several years ago by QED traffic consultants (DCMB, 2003a) that commuters will not travel backwards to go forwards. Thus commuters may take the ring route in an easterly direction to gain access to a freeway access point that is 5 – 6 kilometres further way from a shorter route – or they may not. If they choose to take the shorter route (via Flaxley Road and Wellington Road – the current route) they will only ensure more traffic congestion and time delays at certain peak times of the day. Thus the idea of a ring route easing the traffic problems is short sighted and needs far more consultation with the community.

In addition to this, Council's consultants have indicated said ring route would cost in the vicinity of \$54 – \$70 million excluding land purchases. This, together with a further \$20 million if land acquisition is required at residential land value rates is completely unacceptable to this community. Who will pay for this? Our council does not have the funding for these amounts of capital infrastructure development. Rates are already high (cents/dollar value) compared to the city ratepayers. Will it be funded by the developer's contribution? Once built who will maintain and upgrade it?

Thus to keep the traffic off the now congested roads we believe public transport services need to be increased and promoted further. As there is no rail service and the bus service is under

patronised, what else is there? The current Park 'N' Ride was filled to capacity the day after it opened. There is nowhere else to park neither in the township, nor in Nairne or Littlehampton if a resident wishes to travel by bus to the city. Thus more planning for Park 'N Rides is required, both in Mt Barker and the other townships. This has not been included in The Plan or the discussion papers.

Overall The Plan takes an extremely myopic view to transport and traffic management in our region. The Plan has the opportunity to be innovative, green and commuter friendly but instead returns to the age old pollutant – cars on roads. We believe Council's discussion paper also does not address the transport and traffic issues in sufficient detail and suggest further analysis is required.

Our suggestion is to build a light rail commuter system within the District. Housing could be built in medium density clusters around connection points. We believe this is how one of the principles of The Plan could be incorporated in our region. Not only would it provide clean, green transport options for residents in new outer areas, but it would reduce the amount of traffic on our already congested roads and avoid the unnecessary expense of a Ring Route around the southern areas.

#### **Council Discussion Paper – Transport**

Considering the complexity of this issue, that it is one of major infrastructure cost and impact on the community, there is minimal discussion in Section 9 – Transport.

The premise for transport planning in this District should be based on the reduction of cars using fossil fuels. Therefore building more super roads and connector roads only encourages an already car-dependent society on becoming more so.

Again we recommend the investigation of other options including light rail, public transport services, pedestrian and cycling tracks and appropriate footpaths and gopher paths. We believe these should all be added as specific strategies within the Strategic Directions report. Although the Transport Master Plan addresses many of these issues, we believe they should be explicitly dealt with in the MBDP.

We question the listing of only one issue: *the transport network to meet the needs of the community*. We think this is far too simplistic. In addition we suggest the following issues should be included in the document and future strategies:

1. Overreliance on motor vehicles
2. Inadequate pedestrian and cycle paths
3. Insufficient trails linking towns to each other
4. Inadequate public transport options, routes and services
5. No second freeway interchange (ie what happens to the traffic in growth areas if they are developed before any interchange eventuates)
6. Inadequate parking
7. Traffic congestion at certain points during certain periods (eg at school times, Fridays).
8. One Park n Ride at capacity now – more needed.

## 7. EMPLOYMENT

Certainly the development must allow for employment, and this will have to be in light industry. But light industry can only be secondary industry, and secondary industry value adds to primary industry. Mount Barker has no timber or mineral primary production on which to base secondary industries.<sup>2</sup> However, it does have prime agricultural land and it is logical to base any secondary industries on this. But, this prime agricultural land is designated for housing development by the MDPA – thus, destroying the only local source of primary production available.

The town is not likely to develop sophisticated electronic industries in competition with low waged countries in Asia. Therefore, value adding our primary production is the only way to develop secondary industry. Thus, it is logical to reserve the available agricultural land for food production<sup>3</sup> and create secondary industries in packaging, value-adding and distributing these products nearby<sup>4</sup> (as well as some employment in the primary aspects themselves). A dedicated place should also be provided for a grower's market.

Planning of this magnitude and nature was done in the 1950s, when Elizabeth was developed and it can be done again – once more placing South Australia in the forefront of town planning. The Government's short-sighted view is that because the agricultural land around Mt Barker is not extensively-farmed now, it is of no value for primary production. This land is capable of producing food for centuries although intensive land use requires higher inputs of water, fertiliser, and chemicals and is not sustainable in the long term.

The Government does not have the vision to look forward 50-100 years when this land will be one of the few areas with excellent soils which has good rainfall. The Government also argues the landholdings are too small to support commercial cropping, but is that a reason for covering them with bitumen and houses? A visionary approach would be to build nearby on poorer soils but preserve the better areas as an agricultural heritage area with appropriate buffers of habitat.

We question the wisdom of relying solely on increasing the population by 'importing' workers. Further we question the ethics of importing trained people from the third and/or developing worlds, where they are needed at least as much as they are here. Is it ethical to take from these countries those in whom they have invested their scarce resources to train? We submit that, instead of doing this, we should concentrate on training our own presently under-educated and, therefore, under-employed youth to fulfil the role of caring for our aging population in the future. It may not be an unreasonable thing to say that, instead of having a planning problem, we have an education one. Thus, to import people from overseas whilst our own youth suffer from unemployment and social isolation becomes politically irresponsible.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Tourism is another possibility, but the DPA proposes building housing on the existing picturesque countryside.*

<sup>3</sup> *As the increased population will provide surplus non-potable water that will require ecologically-sound disposal, this water could be provided for food production on the land. To encourage the development of this primary industry, food producers could be given ten years rates free.*

<sup>4</sup> *Like the Beerenberg enterprise in Hahndorf which, it is understood, is looking to expand.*

More specifically there has been no 'new employment' areas set aside in Mt Barker. Yet the Plan calls for 9,000 new jobs. Currently, there are limited employment opportunities in Mt Barker. Our youth struggle to find local employment that will develop career paths for them. Most residents commute to the city for work (ABS, 2006).

In The Plan the economic modelling suggests that manufacturing will grow by \$9.3 billion and increase by 50,000 workers. How is this expected to happen when in SA over past 18 years manufacturing output only grew by 0.7% (Blandy, 2009)? Over the past five years, manufacturing output has fallen, and employed persons have decreased by nearly 30,000 persons (Blandy, op cit). Manufacturing is not the jobs growth focus for our children's futures. Read the newspapers on a daily basis to see how many manufacturing companies have gone into receivership, closed their doors or moved their operations to offshore, in particular to China. Are their jobs for our communities in China? We think not.

#### **Council Discussion paper – Urban Issues**

We support the comments in this section Part 7 – Employment and note the Opportunities section (which may be inappropriately worded as it only talks about the **lack** of opportunities!). We agree that the 30 Year Plan and MDPA fall very short in providing any lands, policy or zoning for employment. Therefore Council will need to take responsibility for this and ensure that each new development includes appropriate land for employment and small business opportunities.

The main issue here will be that developers will only want to build houses (maximum return) but this does not address the myriad of other issues if only houses are built. We commend the Council on its Economics Impact report and suggest it continues to work with the Regional Development Board and other local businesses to ensure further employment and business opportunities are developed.

We agree that the district is not suitable for the establishment of mainstream industrial activity. However the development of light industrial, business or other types of commercial parks would add value to the employment options in the District.

We believe additional strategies could be added to those listed on p36 including the rezoning of residential houses on main arterial roads to light commercial or office/retail. To increase employment, both land and infrastructure is required to build or grow businesses. The infill principle should be adhered to here as well ie build up within the town centre (and expand the town centre).

Further to this Council could develop strategies to encourage the development of small scale, niche, value-adding businesses that complement primary production activities.

## 8. PRIMARY PRODUCTION and FOOD SECURITY

High quality agricultural land has been marked out for intensive residential development on the basis of where opportunistic developers have already purchased or possibly have acquired options to purchase, rather than the food producing potential of that land. It is highly relevant that maps obtained from PIRSA (2004 and 2008) and the University of Adelaide all indicate that land marked on The Plan for development is some of the best agricultural and horticultural land remaining in the vicinity of Mount Barker.

Hillary Clinton stated (Advertiser 28 Sept 2009) that there is a world food shortage due to the economy and climate change. Why would we add to this situation by destroying the very thing that makes our area rich and sustainable? These lands are market garden lands, useful for small and large scale agriculture. PIRSA soil maps (2008) in Council's Rural Issues discussion paper show an abundance of quality soil in the majority of the proposed growth areas.

PIRSA states (2008) that the following lands in the Greater Adelaide Region are used for agriculture:

- i. 25% of total agriculture from the state comes from the Greater Adelaide Region
- ii. 85% vegetables
- iii. 30% fruit
- iv. 40% wine
- v. 40% Dairy/milk

The current urban expansion has already taken a great deal of this land. For more high quality agricultural land to be taken for housing is both irresponsible and negligent. The land adjacent to Bollen Road (currently grazed by the Herbig family) is Class 2 and 3 lands, as is the land adjacent to Fiedler Lane where the current strawberry farm is located. This land is extremely rare and valuable and should be retained at all costs. The land used for potato growing in the district is valuable for its ability to provide a natural fertility back to the soil as there is low soil erosion and therefore more sustainable land use. The dollar returns on these annual crops are around \$10,000 per hectare per crop. As three crops per year can be grown (for some vegetables including brussel sprouts and lettuce) there can be easily a high income created for smart farmers. That is, the land classified Class 1, 2 and 3 and should be protected for future generations for food production.

It is further noteworthy that the Samwell land on the eastern side of Bald Hills Road is rated only Class 3 for market gardening (although prime for vines) while land east and south of Mt. Barker is rated Class 1 for market gardening, horticulture or perennial pasture (PIRSA, 2008), but has been marked for intensive housing development. The ambiguity regarding some areas may be due to basing assessment of land productivity on its use at the time. We urge Council to revisit this land reconstruction and consider the longer term issues of food scarcity, price rises and loss of export income when developing policy for these areas.

A closer study of all these maps reveals that a large area of high quality agricultural land has already been covered by built development, despite the quality and food production potential of the land having been appraised, (e.g. Land Unit No. 27 east of Junction Road, Balhannah and Units 17 and 20 among others to the south and south-west of Mt. Barker). Further

encroachment into this land is once again irresponsible. This area has seen the greatest increase in agricultural growth in the last six years, where all other regions have been stable (PIRSA, 2009). The loss of over 2,000 hectares of prime agricultural land – was the CREAM BOWL of the state and part of an important food source is extremely disappointing and exceedingly irresponsible.

PIRSA (2008) states that it intends to assist formulation of land use policy by State and Local Government. Their report further states that in considering special measures for rural-urban interface areas, councils should avoid putting the onus for mitigating environmental effects, such as noise, odour, visual impact, dust and spray drift, wholly on primary producers. PIRSA further states that rural landholders already have duty of care obligations under various statutes, and that simple (planning) design requirements and buffers to minimize the likelihood of disputes with adjoining rural land, urban and rural residential zones are recommended to ensure the burden of responsibility for mitigating these environmental effects is more equitably shared.

Nowhere are these planning recommendations apparent in practice in our district. No permanent buffers or lines exist. The only temporary “buffer” appears to be land zoned “rural living” or the like, which very frequently becomes degraded agricultural land and eventually residential. The negative consequences of inadequate buffer zones on the residents in adjoining developments have already been experienced in our district, to the detriment of businesses, residents and council.

The iconic Howard’s vineyard on Bald Hills Road is under threat by the additional parcel of land added to the current Nairne town boundary by the MDPA. As a 300 metre buffer zone is required and as such there would be minimal land left for housing on this plot. Those nearby residents would be subject to spray drift, farming noise and heavy transport increases. Again this land in Nairne is prime agricultural land. Why not grow further crops here, and maintain the green zone between Nairne and Blakiston before the town are all merged to form one giant conglomerate of housing.

The futile process of land loss is then repeated with rezoning of more rural land. There has been no attempt to identify and protect good agricultural land in reliable rainfall areas. This could easily have been achieved during the water prescription process, since the Eastern Mount Lofty Watershed was prescribed years ago, with the Western Lofty Watershed nearing completion now.

The PIRSA land assessments provides an *‘informed starting point for considering rezoning options, however PIRSA would still expect to be consulted about any actual rezoning proposals that may eventuate’* (PIRSA, 2008). PIRSA encourages all councils to pay special attention to potential land use conflict problems when developing land use policy for the edge of townships. Problems are usually most pronounced where intensive production systems are involved, but even broad acre farming systems can generate negative environmental effects for neighbours (PIRSA, 2004).

One quite disturbing element of the land now approved for residential development is that this has occurred based on a feeding frenzy of speculation by developers and an assumption that if land is ‘only being grazed’ that is all it can do. Land in this area has changed use over time, as the wheat headlands on some of the steepest pieces of property (created by horse and plough) readily testify. Council’s discussion papers address this issue extremely well.

Intensive farming is not necessarily the correct way forward either. Not only is this poor risk management as regards future dependence on rainfall, underground aquifers and soil fertility, structure and resilience, but it ignores the hazards of intensive agriculture with need for more chemicals, artificial fertilizer and water inputs and consequent pollution and waste creation.

The Fleurieu has an established Farmers' Market and boutique label for its produce. This region has been working towards similar goals and, just as it is within sight of these goals the government heavily handedly decided to impose dense housing development on the best land close to Mt. Barker. Tori Morton, who serves on the Premier's Food Council (Deputy Chair), the Southern Economic Development Board and is heavily involved in the Fleurieu Peninsula The Slow Food Group said *'I cannot emphasize enough the need to preserve good land'* (PIA Conference, 21 August 2009). This statement was repeated by Pip Forrester (Tourism) speaking at the same conference about the making of place. She cited Nappa Valley and Tuscany and said that *'we must protect our peri urban lands for food production – once good food producing land is covered with bricks and concrete it is too late'*.

The food producing potential of the fertile Adelaide Plains (a result of the Flood plain of six creeks) has been completely destroyed by residential development. Yet the Government now seeks to do precisely the same thing in the nearest market garden and food bowl to Adelaide – the Adelaide Hills and Mount Barker. This area will be vital in the future, located as it is, on both major highway and rail routes between Melbourne and Adelaide. Thus the powers of Council need to be exerted to ensure as much land is retained now, with the new MDPA as well as in the future beyond 2026.

#### **Council Discussion Paper – Urban Issues**

The comment in the document at the bottom of page 27 stating that the planned urban boundaries for seven district towns will *'provide assurance to the community and primary producers regarding possible zoning changes and provide the latter with the capacity to undertake long term business planning decisions'* is somewhat redundant and untrue considering the current MDPA. It would be beneficial to Council and the community if this could be relied upon, but history tells us another story.

Council needs to assume that the Government will continue to try and 'steal' our lands, particularly if they provide \$450 million of infrastructure with this MDPA. We believe that Council should remain very wary of any Government or developer intentions with regard further development in the District.

We support the three strategies noted in Section 2 page 28 but note that the wording for the first strategy will need to change as the urban land boundaries governed by the MDPA do not match those addressed in the The Plan.

We suggest further strategies. In addition to 2.2 *'value adding to primary production'* we suggest adding *'supporting and encouraging local producers, as well as sustainable agricultural and farming practices in the region'*. Thus not only is the activity supported but the people attempting to remain on the land are supported also.

We believe all viable Class 1 and Class 2 land should be excluded from any further urban expansion and Council attempt to develop policy around this issue.



**Council Discussion Paper – Rural Issues**

We agree with the comments throughout the first section – Agricultural Overview and have stated similar issues and objectives in our submissions to the 30 Year Plan and MDPA (and have reproduced them for this paper).

**Yes**, it is important if we lose more agricultural land (we do NOT want to lose it) and we agree with the three issues noted by Planning SA in Council's document (p12). We also strongly agree with the three-stepped approach noted on p14.

## 9. ENVIRONMENTAL including BIODIVERSITY

The Plan states that it is intended to retain 13% of existing natural areas (identified as areas of high environmental significance - p129). This is hardly good news, since around 90% of the State's indigenous flora and fauna biodiversity lives in the Mount Lofty Ranges (Greater Adelaide area) and the area of habitat remaining is now less than 13%.

This means that the Government has not set aside any additional habitat despite the unprecedented rate of extinction of plant, animal and bird species currently underway in this region. In the Mt. Barker area remaining habitat is down to 3%, most of which is contained in remnant vegetation in an environmentally fragile area on Mount Barker Summit. We commend Council's policy to establish Policy Zones for some sensitive areas but believe all five special areas should have specific and appropriate safeguards applied to them.

The entire length of Mount Barker (Purtinga) Creek from the town centre to Mount Barker Springs, together with the Creek's natural floodplain, should be set aside for conservation and walking/cycling trails. This is one of few remaining examples in Australia of a natural 'chain of ponds' ecosystem system and should be revegetated where damaged by clearing and recent channelizing (in Mt. Barker). It has potential as an iconic ephemeral wetland walking trail tourist destination. By restoring this eco-system rather than denuding it a seasonal migratory bird stopover would be provided to value-add to the Laratinga Wetland and complement government backed wetland restoration on the Fleurieu Peninsula to support endangered water birds and riparian species.

This makes the strongest case for urban infill and preservation of lands both for agriculture and as potential habitat restoration areas under heritage conservation agreements. Once the land is covered with built development there is no turning back. Some icon bird species are found in the Mount Barker district, among them The Superb Blue Wren, the Yellow-Tailed Black Cockatoo, the Wedge-Tailed Eagle (increasingly rare here now), Buff-banded Landrail, the Crake, the Blue Heron, Honeyeater species, Owl species (Masked, Boobook, Barn and rare Barking Owl).

### **Council Discussion paper – Rural Issues**

We strongly support the retention and ongoing development of strategies which maintain and protect our flora and fauna. Thus in Section 5, the five issues and their corresponding strategies are fully supported.

With regard to Climate Change we note the extensive discussion around this topic. This is important as it will have serious and long lasting implications on all Council strategies, plans and actions.

We support all of the seven issues and corresponding strategies. However, we suggest adding the issue of increased risk of bushfires to Part 11 - 'Bushfire' section in the Urban Issues paper, or create a cross reference from it to this point.

We support the issues and strategies related to Soils and Native Vegetation.

## 10. WATER

Water may be a basic necessity of life and the only natural resource for which there is no substitute – but we have no way of increasing our supply without causing problems elsewhere. Desalination is no solution, since it is highly polluting in terms of energy cost, greenhouse gas emissions and waste output. If the government intends pumping desalinated water up over the ranges the cost of such water will be prohibitive. If that is not intended then all this deliberate fast-tracked growth, and the exponential growth which will derive from that, will be an ever increasing burden on the dying River Murray.

Australia has now joined the growing list of countries (USA, China, Mexico, and Iran) which are draining their aquifers and rivers faster than they can recharge. Some of the aquifers we are draining have taken thousands of years to fill. One example in South Australia is the Wanbi aquifer which the State Government has only recently given permission for a Virginia based company to extract from for irrigation of proposed new pomegranate orchards.

Our high food producing land, water catchments and rivers must be afforded protection now on the basis of ecosystem services which have been taken for granted by previous generations. Failure to do this will consign future generations to third world living conditions beyond our imagination.

Mount Barker is situated in the Barker-Bremer Catchment, a water system vital for the well being of drier and less productive areas to the east, draining all the way to Lake Alexandrina which is in a parlous state. Surely it is not only unsustainable, but morally unacceptable to further pollute this extremely important catchment.

Mount Barker and its surrounds are located on fractured rock aquifers, which means that water travels underground over a large area and is at greater risk of pollution from mineral leaching or polluted storm water run-off. The area also has underlying geological associations with Nairne, Kanmantoo and Brukunga pyrites which forms highly toxic substances when exposed to air and in the mining process. Due to the underlying fractured rock the District cannot store water in our aquifers and the large distance the water travels and interconnects underground is not known. The water in our aquifers must not be placed at even further risk and placing another STEDS stream adjacent the Mount Barker Creek, our only water course, is potent with environmental risk.

How much will water cost and will this depend on how far from the source? These are very important questions which have not been addressed clearly in The Plan. The Government's desalination plant will alleviate water shortages for the city and suburbs but we do not envisage that it will be pumped up to the Hills. Thus the reliance on the River Murray is retained, to the detriment of the Murray and the community.

### **Council Discussion Paper – Urban Issues**

We note the water issues identified in this paper including those relating to water supply, waste water, reclaimed water and stormwater. We support the four strategies listed to address the issues. We feel Council should stand firm about the requirement of adequate and appropriate water management strategies for all new developments. There should be no 'short cuts' in relation to water. We commend Council's stance on water efficiency measures.

**Council Discussion Paper – Rural Issues**

We support the Council's issues and strategy list related to Part 6 - Water Resources (pp 55 – 64) in this discussion paper.

## 11. HEALTH and COMMUNITY SERVICES

Good quality development and planning principles that encourage exercise and social interaction along with a high standard of health care and community services work together to improve the overall health and standing of people living in the Mount Barker district. These benefits can only come to fruition if issues identified in this submission are taken seriously by Council as part of its consultation for the DP Review.

Generally the Mount Barker region has not had the same level of services as parts of metropolitan Adelaide, despite the fact towns such as Mount Barker, Nairne and Littlehampton being closer to the Adelaide CBD than many outer Adelaide suburbs. Over the past 10-20 years the residential population for the Mount Barker area has dramatically increased, having some of the highest population increases in the State. One area needing vast improvement is in the field of health and community services.

Having people 'thrown together' at a high rate can have major impacts on the general community – much of it negative. Dramatic population increases and rapid expansion can take away the ability of people and communities to connect. At least a decade is needed for people to personally discover others and evolve. Towns such as Mount Barker, Nairne and Littlehampton have coped poorly with a dramatic rise in population. Housing standards have been deplorable, with homes so close to each other in new housing areas – something seen as unsustainable in current planning documentation. Healthy and vibrant communities are difficult to establish and maintain in such an environment.

### Medical and health services

Questions have been raised if medical services will be able to cope with a dramatic increase in population for the Mount Barker area as currently many services are at stretching point. All services provided at the Mt Barker Hospital for example need more financial assistance to properly service the community.

Critical areas needing more support are the obstetrics service and the provision of afterhour's doctor services. Respite care to assist elderly and disabled people must be improved and there needs to be a better focus crisis care for people in need or for those affected by domestic violence. Local mental health services must also be given closer attention by government. There are no domestic violence services, aged care and community services are severely limited due to a lack of adequate funding and resources. This cycle cannot continue and these issues are not addressed in The Plan.

All health services will need to be increased. There is no indication how this will be planned. The MDPA indicates 'market forces' will create demand for services. This is inconsistent with the 30 Year plan which was supposedly developed to guide the thinking for the MDPA.

What consideration has been given to The Adelaide Hills Country Health Services DRAFT 10 Year Local Health Service Plan 2010 – 2019 (see information at pp 4 -6 about the need for future services)? What will happen to the current District Hospital and its associated health services? The Adelaide Hills Country Health Services DRAFT 10 Year Local Health Service Plan 2010 – 2019 states '*The current site for the Mt Barker and District Health Services (ie the hospital) may not be the best site to meet the health service needs for the Mt Barker District*

*and Greater Hills Area into the future. Further analysis of this is required before the rapid population growth in the Mt Barker and Strathalbyn areas. Urgent investment is required to improve the patient journey and provide services close to home' (pp 4 – 5, Executive Summary).*

#### **Education services**

Educationally, tertiary education must be improved in Mount Barker – such as the provision of tertiary agricultural studies and having some level of University campus in Mount Barker similar to that at Mount Gambier or Waikerie. Furthermore any local schools that are a state government responsibility should be given a high priority as many parents are sending their children to schools in other areas. With education we have an opportunity to create a wide range of skilled and creative people who can benefit South Australia.

We suggest that the Hills region (with Mt Barker as the leader) should be promoted as an Education Centre of Excellence (ECE). There are already nine education institutions located here now. A tertiary education provider has also shown some interest in locating a campus here. This provides the Government and the Council, as well as the community with a substantial targeted opportunity for economic growth as well as tourism. This would mirror the City of Adelaide's target strategy to become the Education City of Australia.

Consider the potential if international students were to locate here to study at secondary or tertiary providers, including university and/or TAFE? The financial, cultural and economic benefits would be similar, albeit on a smaller scale, to those found in other educational centres around the world. Thus we strongly encourage Council to consider developing and promoting the region as education centric.

#### **Youth services**

Our youth are our future and plans to help, assist and retain young people in our area are vital! Improving the community we live in through better parks, schools, social activity, music and arts, festivals and events as well as government services will help young people into adult life, have them perform better at school and/or work and at the same time boost the local economy through people working more efficiently and personally feeling better about them.

#### **Emergency services/management**

Many emergency services (Fire, Police, Ambulance and SES) may have difficulty servicing these new growth areas adequately. The MDPA does not address these services adequately. We strongly disagree with the MDPA statement that there is no need for further services.

#### **Bushfire Management**

We appreciate that the MDPA has retained the District as a Medium Bushfire Risk level. Strategic planning for bushfire evacuation procedures should be incorporated in Council's planning processes and linked to the [Government's Bushfire Management and Action Plans](#). The 30 Year Plan (p148) includes three excellent policies to address bushfire risk. Council's strategic report must include appropriate and adequate bushfire management strategies to ensure the safety of its citizens should a bushfire calamity occur. This is particularly critical whilst there is only one exit ramp to the freeway.

#### **Council Discussion paper – Urban Issues**

In Part 5 – Social Planning we note and support the discussion around community

development, the library and recreation and open space. We feel that along with the enhancement of the Library (which has been noted as a case study) that a Civic Centre needs to be featured in any future planning strategies.

We understand the pressures on all community assets but believe that an appropriate community hub, whether it be a Civic Centre, Town Hall or other unique central place established for the community is essential and sadly lacking in the town of Mt Barker. As a Regional Centre it lacks a 'heart'. An iconic Civic Centre would help to create a sense of community within the town as well as provide a community asset for theatre, the arts, community groups and other activities. It could also become the 'shop front' of Council, including a Mayoral 'drop in' office.

Any further expansion or development of the Library must be researched extensively to ensure national and international best practices are adopted. The SA State Library's use of e-technology is one such example. With the increasing adoption of e-books it may be that a virtual library is a much better development opportunity than physical space.

Item 2 in this section discussion Recreation and Open Space. Again we support the discussion in this section, but wish to state, once again for the record that there is no current Recreation and Sport Plan or an Open Space Plan. This discussion notes the Mt Barker Recreational Trails Strategy but this is insufficient on which to base future recreation and open space planning. This Association has held a public forum, presented a deputation to Council and written numerous letters about the lack of these two important plans. Once again, we request that Council includes these plans in its future strategies list.

At Issue 3.1 we suggest adding the word '*sport*' so that the strategy is to develop a **Sport and Recreational Plan**, not just a Recreational Plan. There are two issues identified in Item 3.3 and we suggest these be listed independently as two separate issues.

We note in this section the lack of any discussion around culture and arts. Again we see this as a serious omission and have lobbied Council on numerous occasions to develop an Arts and Culture Plan, or better still, to adopt the one developed by a group of artisans in 2009 and presented to Council. There is still no high level Arts and Culture strategy in Council's planning policy.

At Part 11 – Bushfire the discussion is again somewhat minimal for such an important issue; in particular relating to evacuation procedures should a bushfire disaster occur. Again, this policy area should be developed further and there must be linkage to the Government and Regional bushfire safety management plans.

#### **Council Discussion paper – Rural Issues**

We note and support the discussion at Section 8 – Community Issues. We question the inclusion of Item 1.4 in this section and believe it may be more beneficial to include this information in a separate 'Transport' section. It should also cross reference to any issues raised in the Urban Issues paper.

In Table 2 on page 103 we note the inclusion of the Power of the Past as a Mt Barker Showgrounds user. This is incorrect. Power of the Past is an event, initiated and managed by

the Adelaide Hills Motor Restorers Club (AHMRC). Thus the AHMRC is the user group. They also lease space in a small shed on the Showgrounds site.

We also question the exclusion of the Mountain Pool in this list of council facilities.

We support the issues and strategise list at Section 3, pp 105 – 106.



## 12. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Currently there is limited open space available for future generations. More than the 12.5% open space requirement should be provided with all new housing and residential development. Good quality open space (e.g. ovals, parks) is desperately needed with existing open space retained. This is to encourage exercise, quality of life, improvement of mental health and reduction in crime rates. Areas are also needed for people to exercise their pets as well as themselves. Obesity is a serious issue in Australia and this region is not immune from the significant health issues related to over indulgence in fatty foods and under exercising.

It is hoped the State Government will look 'outside the square' when it comes to healthcare - good planning, open space, recreational facilities as well as having good quality health and education services. It is hoped the State Government will take the provision of planning, health and community services a lot more seriously than has occurred in more recent years with Mount Barker and nearby townships - regardless of the population in the Mount Barker District.

There are no plans to accommodate schools, kindergartens or childcare centres. The MDPA notes that the community will have to wait for market demand before any are planned or constructed but we believe this is reactive, rather than proactive -as planning should be. *'Given the full range of emergency services conveniently located within Mount Barker, the provision of additional services within the new urban area is unlikely to be necessary'* (MDPA, Page 71).

There is an urgent need to improve the current school services for the current population before further growth occurs. There are long waiting lists for most private schools in Mt Barker at present. There is no funding or land detailed for any schools.

The Library needs to be better resourced for an increased population. It will not cope with large scale increases in population. It has not been upgraded for many years. Again, who will fund this?

The present Post Office is a total disaster for people to collect their mail. There is nothing in the plan to indicate how this will be alleviated with the increased population. There are only three car parks to collect your mail. How can this be suitable for a growing population?

### **Mental health, increased stress for the local community**

This scale and scope of development will disturb resident's peace and stability. The example currently in place - the corner of Wellington Road and Sims Road - is one roundabout construction but this alone is causing residents to seek medical attention. What will happen to the mental health of affected people?

Current developments are causing a significant loss of quality of life, increased anxiety, depression, stress and potential suicides. This has been occurring for the past 10 -15 years. Do residents have to put up with this for the next 30 years? Will people be forced to move to another area to have a peaceful existence? People are already moving. We have many examples of people moving to other areas. Why do residents have to move to have a reasonable quality of life?

There is no compensation, or services to provide support to the resultant mentally ill or depressed.

This MDPA will create future ghettos, with no provision for essential services and public transport. Will this create more vandalism and graffiti with a bored youth? There are no services for the youth. No jobs. Just more of the same boring lifestyles which lead them to lives of crime.

#### **Recreation and Open Space**

Further to this, recreational infrastructure is sadly lacking. A 33 and a third yard swimming pool built by public donation in 1957 is insufficient for the existing 29,000 of the district, let alone double that figure. The town's main oval suffers from water issues, and even though new plans are in train for two new ovals on the outskirts of the township, these proposals are yet to be planned for funding or use.

No recreation, sporting or open space areas have been zoned nor clearly identified or planned. All other zones are neighbourhood zones but there are no Public Purpose zones.

If the Council is forced to sell its parcel of land on Bald Hills and Springs Road to fund infrastructure, there will be no recreation land indicated in the plan.

There are no details of the open space and natural corridors linkages. These need to be firmly established before any land is released (MDPA p4).

#### **Culture and arts**

There is absolutely no inclusion of arts and culture requirements for a new community. This has been noted previously in this document.

#### **Tourism Potential**

The Plan (and the MDPA) is silent about the loss of tourism land, amenities and dollars. There is no consideration given to the fact that tourists drive through the Hills to see green paddocks, old majestic gum trees and quaint historical cottages. Our current tourist routes will be lost to suburban sprawl.

The Mt Barker District and the roads between it and its adjacent towns and settlements have many stunning settings. These will all be lost and only Alexandrina and Onkaparinga Councils will have Tourist Drives. Ours will be 'suburb' drives.

We see that the discussion about tourism is not included in any of the two discussion papers and question this considering Council is a member of the Adelaide Hills Regional Development Board.

#### **Indigenous land use history**

This MDPA shows absolutely no respect for Indigenous lands – the Peramangk people's land use history is being destroyed. Covering their lands with housing is offensive to the Indigenous people. This is exactly the same as what occurred in Australia in the 18th century and South Australia in 1836.

What degree of consultation has occurred with the Indigenous communities? Has any respect been shown for their culture or history? We understand there are Indigenous burial sites in this landscape, and acknowledged areas of settlement.

Council's Discussion papers fall short of identifying these issues also. We suggest any inclusion of Indigenous people's or land's issues should be developed in conjunction with the Peramangk people.

### 13. CONCLUSION

The Council's planning process has the opportunity to develop policies and strategies which encourage cluster and medium density housing, attempting to save our valuable agricultural lands, supporting appropriate and adequate infrastructure and transport requirements and all based on best practice throughout the world.

South Australia needs to ensure its future resilience in the face of unmitigated climate change, increasing water shortages and growing scarcity of food, water and natural resources.

We feel very strongly that Council must not be over influenced by developers and continues to ask the people what they want.

We support fully the stance taken by Council in its response to The Plan. Together, with other concerned community groups and residents, we are all united against the Government on these important local issues.

We encourage Council to develop a Development Plan that is exciting, welcomed by the community and innovative for all.

Please work with our local communities to develop initiatives that are innovative, invigorating and exciting. Develop ideas that will sustain not only the current, but also the future generations.

Let us leave behind a positive legacy - **One that we can be proud of and one that we all want!**

## REFERENCES

- ABC Ch 2 News programs (2010), 22 June and 25 July
- ABC Radio National's Background Briefing programme (2010) 25 July edition
- The Adelaide Hills Country Health Services DRAFT 10 Year Local Health Service Plan 2010 – 2019*, (2010), Released for community consultation, June
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2006), Census, Government of Australia, Canberra. Accessed at <http://www.abs.gov.au/> on 22 September
- Blandy R (2009), The 30 year Plan for Greater Adelaide - an economist's perspective; Presentation to Northern Economic Leaders, 2 September 2009; School of Management, University of South Australia and AustralAsia\*Economics Pty Ltd
- Courier (2010), July 28 edition
- Cribb J (2010), The Coming Famine, (CSIRO publication in press)
- Community Engagement Group Australia (Cega) and EconSearch (2010), *Economic Impacts Associated with Population Growth in the Mt Barker District*, prepared for the District Council of Mt Barker
- District Council of Mt Barker (2009), Managed Growth (with Appendices) – Council's Submission to the draft 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, September
- District Council of Mt Barker (2003), Residential and Industry Strategy 2020: Towards Sustainability: Section 1: 18 August, Prepared by Hassells
- District Council of Mt Barker (2003a), Residential and Industry Strategy 2020: Towards Sustainability: Section 2, Appendix B: Mt Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne: Transport Management Master Plan: Stage 2 Potential Future Development: 18 August, Prepared by Hassells and QED
- District Council of Mt Barker (2006), Recreational Trails Strategy 2006 – 2010
- District Council of Mt Barker (2009), Transport Master Plan (TMP) 2009 – 2019
- District Council of Mt Barker (2010), Agenda Papers, 2 August
- District Council of Mt Barker (2010), *Submission to the Ministerial Mt Barker Urban Growth DPA*, August
- Government of South Australia (2009), *30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide: A Volume of the Planning Strategy*
- Government of South Australia (2010), Ministerial Development Plan Amendment
- Mt Barker and District Residents' Assoc Submission to Council's Development Plan Review | January 2011*

Forster C (2004), *Australian Cities – Continuity and Change*, Oxford University Press, South Melbourne, pp. 188-189

Government of South Australia (2006), *Planning Strategy for the Outer Metropolitan Adelaide Region*

Hamilton C (2003), *Growth Fetish*, Elsevier, Also paper in *Ecological Economics*, Vol. 47, Issues 2-3, December, pp 219-220

Hugo G (2008), 'Australia's state-specific and regional migration scheme: an assessment of its impacts in South Australia'; *Int. Migration & Integration* 9, pp125-145

Hugo G, (2009), Presentation to NRMB Information event, Mt Barker Golf Club, Mt Barker

Lawn P (2008), 'Ecological tax reform: Many know why but few know how', *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 2. pp 143-164

Lawn P and Clarke M (2006), *Measuring Genuine Progress*, Nova Science Publishers, New York

Morton T (2009), Premier's Food Council, Presentation to the Planning Institute of Australia Conference, 21 August, 2009

Newman P and Jennings J (2008), *Cities as Sustainable Ecosystems – Principles and Practices*, Island Press, Washington, D.C. pp. 91, 102, 103-105

PIRSA (2008), Dept. of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (2004, 2008)

PIRSA (2004), Maps of soil quality in the DC of Mt Barker

PIRSA (2009), Presentation to NRMB information event, Mt Barker Golf Club, Mt Barker.

South Australia Freight Council Inc (2006); *South Australia's Freight Transport Infrastructure, Moving Freight – Setting a Strategic Framework for the Future*, March

The Advertiser (2009), Sept 28 edition

Watson C (2010) *The Advertiser*

**Review of Council wide Objectives**

The following are our comments on the District-wide Objectives as they appear in the current Development Plan, indicating how they should be up-dated in any review of the Development Plan. It is a first attempt at showing how they could be strengthened to enhance planning decisions. It is not a complete review as there are too many objectives, we are not experts and they require discussion and analysis with other citizens.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold  
Formatted: Font: Not Bold

We understand the objectives are 'guides' only when used to support planning decisions. Thus we feel that one hundred objectives may be too many and that they become inconsistent and applied inappropriately to suit certain applicants. It also provides an avenue for developers to use one objective and not another. For example Objective 3: provision for a choice of housing and lifestyles could mean open slather to a developer, whereas Objective 11 attempts to rationalise this further.

We believe that objectives should be included in the new Development Plan but they be reviewed, rewritten and reconsidered by a broad sector of the community, as well as Councillors and planning staff. We concur with Mr Brian Calvert's list of objectives which appear to be missing in the new Development Plan. We support his request that they be included in any new plan.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

We understand that planning officers will integrate this information rationally into any new Development Plan, thus eliminating repetitions and omissions.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold  
Formatted: Font: Not Bold  
Formatted: Font: Not Bold

**General**

Objective 1: Satisfaction of the social, cultural and economic needs of the population of the district and surrounding region.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Objective 2: The development of employment opportunities for the district population.

Objective 3: Provision for a choice of housing and lifestyles. Add that all new housing should conform to current eco-fiendly design requirements.

Objective 4: Provision of public facilities and tourist development in appropriate locations to support and encourage the growth of the district's tourist industry.

Objective 5: Development of Mount Barker township as the district's main urban and rural service centre.

Objective 6: Co-ordination of district development with development in neighbouring council districts, having regard to national, regional and local interests.

Objective 7: Provision of land suitable for residential, industrial, commercial, retailing, office, cultural, recreation and development, open space and mining, development,

Commented [DR1]: Now covered in #4

Objective 8: Accommodation of an expanding population through more efficient use of land within the townships. If this is code for infill with medium-density housing, why not say this?

Additional: Requiring all new building and re-developments to be ecologically sustainable and CO2 minimal.

Additional: Preservation of suitable rural land for food production (This may be covered elsewhere.)

Additional: Preservation or creation of areas of native vegetation and wildlife habitat and wildlife

corridors.

Objective 9: The maintenance of a clear delineation between urban and rural development, with appropriate, buffer zones between rural and residential zones.

Additional: The development of an economic, CO2 minimal and efficient public transport system, particularly in those areas visible from roads approaching the townships.

Objective 10: Rational distribution of land uses to avoid incompatibility of those uses.

### **Form of Development**

Formatted: Font: Bold

Objective 11: Orderly, ecologically sound and economic development. New housing and other urban development should be continuous with and form compact extensions of existing built-up areas. Orderly development will achieve economy in the provision of public utilities, be conducive to the creation of a safe, convenient and pleasant environment in which to live, and contribute to the retention of rural land for the purposes of primary production, recreation, and water and nature conservation, thereby preserving the beauty of the countryside.

Commented [DR2]: Redundant. And what does it mean anyway?

Objective 12: A proper distribution and segregation of living, working and recreational activities by the allocation of suitable areas of land for those purposes.

A proper distribution and segregation of residential, business, commercial, industrial and recreational development benefits the community and enables a town to function more efficiently. Accessibility is safer and more convenient; property values remain more stable and fewer difficulties arise due to incompatible development being intermixed, eg workshops and housing. A traffic and transport

Objective 13: The proper location of public and community facilities by the reservation of suitable land in advance of need. It is prudent to ensure that land required for public purposes should be available in the right place at the right time by reserving such land for future acquisition before it is used for other purposes.

Commented [DR4]: Redundant

### **Residential Development**

Formatted: Font: Bold

Objective 14: Residential development that creates safe, convenient, attractive and pleasant living areas and that are designed according to ecologically sound principles! -

Objective 15: Containment of housing costs through the encouragement of a full range of dwelling designs and development techniques.

Objective 16: Medium density dwelling development in the appropriate policy areas and locations identified in the Residential Zone provisions.

Objective 17: Residential development that reflects the rural character of townships

Objective 18: Residential development that incorporates energy and water efficiency design features.

Objective 19: Residential development that occurs in co-ordination with the orderly provision of infrastructure.

#### Centres and Shops

Objective 20: Shopping, administrative, cultural, community, entertainment, educational,



religious, and recreational, facilities located in integrated centres.

Objective 21: Centres established and developed in accordance with a hierarchy based on function of each type of centre as appropriate for the region.

Objective 22: A hierarchy of centres located in centre zones.

~~The grouping of a wide range of facilities in integrated centres will benefit the community by encouraging economic, and shared, use of facilities, providing a meeting place for communities, and encouraging ready access by both public and private transport.~~

Centres outside the area of metropolitan Adelaide are of the following types:

- (a) regional town centre;
- (b) district centre;
- (c) neighbourhood centre; and
- (d) local centre.

The Planning Strategy for the Outer Metropolitan region provides for regional town centres within the Mount Barker and Victor Harbour townships. Given the level of services available in the Mount Barker regional town centre, there is not a need for a district centre within the Mount Barker Council area.

The degree to which the various facilities can be located within a centre will depend, among other things, upon the size of the centre, the specific policies relating to the centre, the implications of competing centres for the population being served, and the characteristics of the population to be served. Each development proposal for a centre should be evaluated against that centre's, and other centres', defined roles in the centres hierarchy.

New development in centres should result in the expansion of the total range of retail goods and services available to the population to be served, having regard to the location and role of other existing and proposed centre zones, and be of a size and type which would not demonstrably lead to the physical deterioration of any existing centre zone, or designated shopping area.

The identification of each zone or area in a hierarchy of centres should be such as to:

- (a) cater for existing and future shopping, cultural and community needs;
  - (b) provide a degree of choice in the location of centre facilities;
  - (c) be safely and readily accessible to the population to be served, particularly by public transport (where appropriate), and obviate the need for unscheduled large-scale traffic and transport works;
  - (d) have minimal adverse impacts on residential areas;
  - (e) concentrate development on one side of a primary road, or one quadrant of a primary road intersection, and have minimal adverse impact on traffic movements on primary roads.
- Linear extension of centre zones, or areas, along primary and primary arterial roads is to be minimised;
- (f) reflect the potential to rehabilitate, or extend, existing centre zones, or areas, and make effective use of existing investment in public infrastructure, utilities and transport, with any costs involved being offset by benefits to the population being served;
  - (g) be of a size and shape suitable for their functions, with car parking and public transport stops provided;
  - (h) have regard to the maintenance of employment levels in the area; and
  - (i) have regard to the degree to which existing centres satisfy the above objectives.

The development of new centres may be staged, and specific areas may be set aside for community and other non-retail uses, with the total integrated development producing a character desired for that particular centre.

Objective 23: ~~To facilitate the development of a regional town centre to provide shopping, This is out of date now. Should be changed.~~

business and community facilities that meet the needs of the community it serves. The regional town centre should be the principal focus for all business activities in the central Mount Lofty Ranges. The range of services and facilities offered in the regional town centre should provide a range of convenience and comparison shopping, offices, administration, community services, entertainment, recreation and cultural activities. New development that is intended to service the district or region should look to establish itself in this centre. Development that is intended to only service the local community should be located within a Local or Neighbourhood Centre Zone.

The following list indicates those facilities that are appropriate in a fully developed regional town centre:

Ambulance Station	Motor Registration Office
Bank	Office (general, professional, governmental)
Child Minding/Child Care Centre	Park
Church	Parking Area
Cinema	Petrol Filling Station
Civic Centre	Personal Service Establishment
Club/Meeting Hall	Police Station
Community Centre	Pre-school
Community Library	Post Office
Consulting Room	Primary School
Day Care Centre	Restaurant
Major Retail Outlet	Recreation Area
Emergency Service Centre	Retail Showroom
Educational Establishment	Shop
Funeral Parlour	Special School
Health Centre	Supermarket
Hospital	Swimming Pool
Hotel/Tavern	Tourist Accommodation
Indoor Recreation Centre	Tourist Attraction
Library	Tourist Information Centre
Motel	<u>Meeting Rooms</u>
<u>Art gallery</u>	<u>Concert Hall</u>
<u>Offices</u>	

Objective 24: Neighbourhood centres to include shopping facilities that provide mainly 'convenience' goods to serve the day-to-day needs of the neighbourhood, and a limited range of more frequently required 'comparison' goods. There are not likely to be administrative facilities in neighbourhood centres.

The size of a neighbourhood centre, and the range of facilities within it, may vary within the region but it should be related to the size and characteristics of the population it serves.

The following list indicates those facilities that are appropriate in a fully developed neighbourhood centre:

Child Minding/Child Care Centre	Personal Service Establishment
Church	Petrol Filling Station
Club/Meeting Hall	Playing Field
Community Welfare Local Office	Pre-school
Consulting Room	Primary School
Local Health Centre	Restaurant
Motor Repair Station	Shop
Office	Squash Court
Park	Supermarket

Objective 25: Local centres to include shopping and local community facilities to serve the day-to-day needs of the local community.

Local centres on arterial, or primary, roads should comply with the same criteria as those for other centres.

Objective 26: Retailing, not consistent with facilities envisaged in a centre, located and operated so as not to adversely affect any designated centre, commercial, business or residential area, and traffic movement on local, primary and primary arterial, roads.

The diversification of locations for retailing, which provides goods and services not compatible with the grouping of facilities envisaged for regional, district and neighbourhood centres, may be considered so long as the integrity of the centre hierarchy is not compromised and the development is compatible with land uses in the locality.

Retail and commercial development should be evaluated having regard to:

- (a) its locational and operational compatibility with existing shopping, business, commercial areas, including the nature of the goods and materials to be stocked, and the noise levels of vehicles and plant used on, and servicing, the site;
- (b) its effect on adjacent residential development;
- (c) the increased use of local and primary roads;
- (d) the adequacy of vehicular access and car parking;
- (e) and the maintenance of building and site development standards required for centres.

The following list indicates those facilities that are appropriate in a local centre:

Child Minding/Child Care Centre	Personal Service Establishment
Church	Petrol Filling Station
Club/Meeting Hall	Restaurant
Consulting Room	Shop
Motor Repair Station	Squash Court <u>(tennis???)</u>
Office	

Objective 27: An integrated and diverse range of activities within Centre Zones which provide a focus for a range of compatible services, facilities and activities accessible to all sectors of the population in order to ensure that the quality of life of residents is maintained and improved.

Objective 28: Provision of centres that are lively, vibrantly developed as community focal points providing a high level of amenities and safety for residents, visitors and workers.

Objective 29: Centres designed and operated to enhance public security and safety

Objective 30: Centres with clearly defined effective and pleasant pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access routes to and from the centre and between the various activities within the centre.

Objective 31: Centres that are integrated with surrounding residential areas.

### **Industrial Development**

Objective 32: Industrial development including, manufacturing, packaging, warehouse, storage, ancillary commercial and transport distribution on appropriately located land, integrated with

Formatted: Font: Bold

transport networks and designed to minimise potential impact on these networks.

Objective 33: Minimisation of industrial or commercial traffic in residential areas.

Objective 34: Industrially zoned allotments and land uses protected from encroachment by adjoining uses that would reduce industrial development or expansion.

Objective 35: Industrial development occurring without adverse effects on the health and amenity of occupiers of land in adjoining zones.

Objective 36: Compatibility between industrial uses within industrial zones.

Objective 37: Protection and enhancement of visual amenity, and a high standard of design through the use of landscaping, fencing, setbacks and façade articulation; particularly adjacent to arterial roads and sensitive land uses in non-industrial zones.

Objective 38: Co-location of industries in townships to enable promotion and implementation of innovative waste recovery practices, methods of power generation and reuse of by-products, and economies of scale.

Objective 39: Remediation of adverse impacts (including land contamination) of existing or past industrial activities.

#### **Movement of People and Goods**

Objective 40: Safe and efficient flow of traffic.

Objective 41: The safe and efficient movement of people and goods.

Objective 42: The free flow of traffic on roads by minimising interference from adjoining development. ~~Some kinds of development attract large numbers of vehicles that can create traffic hazards and congestion on streets in the vicinity unless special provision is made to accommodate them. Off street parking should be provided in association with development so that streets can provide for the safe and efficient flow of traffic.~~

Objective 43: Road infrastructure provided to ensure safe and convenient interconnection of residential areas.

Objective 44: The establishment of a system of scenic routes.

A system of scenic routes should be established and signposted through the region. Such routes should pass through attractive areas, and link vantage points and places of interest.

Objective 45: Provision of attractive landscaped off-street car parking areas.

Objective 46: Provision for improved pedestrian environments, particularly in shopping, community and business areas.

Objective 47: Provision of safe, pleasant, accessible, integrated and permeable pedestrian and cycling networks.

#### Urban Design

Objective 48: Distinctive, legible, interesting and safe urban and rural areas.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Commented [DR11]: Unnecessary?

Objective 49: Building design and material selection to maximise the thermal performance, comfort and energy efficiency.

### Public Utilities

Objective 50: The construction of drainage works with minimum intrusion on areas of natural beauty. A means of implementing such a policy could be to hold surplus stormwater by the use of retention dams, thus preserving creeks in their natural form as drainage channels. Some retention dams could be incorporated into recreation areas, but they should not be constructed on any of the main watercourses feeding reservoirs.

Formatted: Font: Bold

### Mining

Objective 51: The siting, operation and rehabilitation of quarrying and mining sites in a manner that minimises adverse environmental impacts.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Objective 52: The siting and management of quarrying and similar extractive and associated manufacturing industries so that minimum damage is caused to the landscape.

The permanent effect of mining operations on the appearance of the landscape and water front areas ~~must~~ be considered before operations begin, and the suitability of alternative sites investigated. After workings are finished undesirable structures should be removed, quarry faces beautified by landscaping, or the natural cover of the land restored. In some cases the redevelopment of some areas to other uses should be considered.

Mineral deposits in some instances, underlie other basic resources such as remnant bushland and scenic areas. Development of mineral deposits in these areas should only proceed following full evaluation of the benefits to the community in retaining bushland or scenery as opposed to the development of the deposits, and the relative abundance of alternative mineral deposits.

In particular, mining activities in areas suitable for conservation or recreation parks should take place only in the State or national interest under stringent conditions following precise delineation of the sites. The overriding consideration shall be the interests of the community, not those of the miner.

Objective 53: The continued availability of metallic, industrial, and construction, minerals by preventing development likely to inhibit their exploitation.

Mineral resources in the region ~~shall~~ be delineated so that adequate supplies of minerals can be secured in areas where there is no major environmental conflict. The most suitable sites, consistent with environmental constraints and expected future demand, should be kept free of development likely to inhibit the exploitation of the resource.

The Kanmantoo copper resource is still classed as a proven resource and there is potential for mining activity to be re-established in the area. Accordingly development within the Kanmantoo area should be compatible with such activity.

Sufficient land should be ~~made~~ available to provide resources for continued production and for the establishment of buffer areas between the mineral deposit and adjoining development.

### Waste Management

Objective 54: The orderly and economic development of waste management facilities

Objective 55: Minimisation of environmental impacts from the location and operation of waste management facilities.

Objective 56: Waste management facilities to be protected from incompatible development.

## Conservation

Objective 57: The protection of the Mount Lofty Ranges watershed against pollution and contamination.

Objective 58: The maintenance and enhancement of the natural resources of the Mount Lofty Ranges region.

Objective 59: Protection of the environment from noise and visual pollution and the pollution of air, land or water.

Objective 60: The conservation, preservation, or enhancement, of scenically attractive areas including land adjoining water and scenic routes.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Land holders should be encouraged to conserve the character of all attractive areas in the region. Consideration should also be given to any disturbance which the siting of sporting activities may cause adjoining properties, particularly from noise, traffic generation, or the effect on the natural beauty of the locality. ~~Wider-ranging activities~~Activities such as dune buggy and trail bike riding and all forms of off-road vehicles can have

## Heritage Places – State and Local

Objective 61: The preservation of all buildings or sites of architectural, historical or scientific interest.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Objective 62: The conservation of all places of historic value to indigenous and non-indigenous ~~c~~Cultures

The Council area contains land, buildings and structures of State and local heritage value. All heritage places within the area covered by this Development Plan are listed in Tables MtB/11 and 12 . These places and settings should be conserved for the benefit of present and future generations and to maintain a cultural and historic record of the settlement of the State and District. (Conservation of places can also enhance the attractiveness of the council area to tourists and visitors. ~~– unnecessary?~~)

The Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 ~~shall apply applies~~ to any sites, objects and remains of Aboriginal significance.

In considering proposals involving the conservation of places of heritage value, the existing character and appearance of a place and its contribution to the heritage character of the locality should be regarded. The historic character of a place is specifically influenced by design, the relationship of built form to open space, construction, materials and colours.

There are buildings and sites of cultural architectural historical and scientific interest in the Mount Barker district that warrant preservation. An awareness of their existence is the first stage in preservation.

Objective 63: The continued use, or adaptive re-use of heritage places that supports their conservation.

In some cases, the conservation of places of heritage value may only be achievable through change of use. If conservation objectives underpin adaptive forms of land use, such uses should be encouraged, and considered on their merit. Adaptive reuse means a use which may be different from the original use and function, but not so different as to destroy or remove the heritage value.

Objective 64: Conservation of the setting of heritage places.

### **Open Space**

Objective 65: The creation of recreation areas by establishing parks and reserves. Before any areas are acquired as public open space or subjected to any control, consideration should be given to the effect on the management of relevant properties, in particular, economic viability, convenience of operation, access to water and services, and the possible effects of public access. Detailed investigations should also be made of flora and fauna, ~~with~~ surveys of outer boundaries carried out in co-operation with local land owners as far as possible.

The southern portion of the proposed "Heysen Trail", a bushwalking track connecting Cape Jervis and the Northern Flinders Ranges, passes through the region. This will link many of the parks and provide a central spine from which other spur and loop tracks could be routed.  
[Insist upon more than the 12.5% open space requirements from developers.](#)  
[Do not include land under transmission lines as 'open space'.](#)

### **Appearance of Land and Buildings**

Objective 66: The protection and enhancement of the views from the South Eastern Freeway.

The South Eastern Freeway is the principal route through the Mount Lofty Ranges for road traffic between Adelaide and Victoria. Views from the freeway should be protected from unsightly development in both urban and rural areas.

Objective 67: The amenity of localities not impaired by the appearance of land, buildings, and objects. Untidy commercial sites, poorly maintained holiday houses, and abandoned structures, should not be allowed to mar the landscape in the region. [Retain 'landscape' zoning wherever possible, but particularly on hills and slopes and including the Mount and hill in Littlehampton opposite Anembo Park.](#)

### **Rural Areas**

Objective 68: Conservation and preservation of the ~~attractive~~ open rural character of the district.

Objective 69: Productive agricultural land protected from conversion to non-productive or noncompatible uses [in particular housing.](#)

Objective 70: The retention of rural areas primarily for agricultural, pastoral and forestry purposes, and the maintenance of the natural character and beauty of such areas.

Pressures for the division of rural land are likely to accelerate because of the commuting possibilities that the Mount Lofty Ranges and other near-metropolitan areas offer to people who work in the metropolitan area. The removal of primary production from rural areas places greater dependence upon the diminishing fertile areas. It is in the community interest that as much agricultural land as possible be retained in primary production. The region contains some of the best agricultural land in the State and is ideally situated to serve the food requirements of the metropolitan area. The protection of the natural beauty, agricultural land and water resources, should remain the overriding consideration governing decisions relating to development of rural land in the outer metropolitan area.

### **Country Townships**

Objective 71: Development of country townships contained within defined boundaries. Controlled and orderly development, restricted to defined townships, can assist in the economic provision of public services, the creation of a pleasant living environment, and the retention of surrounding rural areas primarily for agriculture, recreation, and water and nature conservation.

[Add in a provision for freezing of existing town boundaries for the preservation of food producing rural](#)

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold

[land and to obviate escalating land valuations and rates for rural land.](#)

The growth of country townships situated in water catchment areas should be restricted to minimize pollution of water resources.

Medium-density dwellings [should be encouraged](#) ~~may be appropriate~~ in country townships under strict siting, design, and open space provisions, ~~to retain a low overall~~ [for optimal](#) residential density and the amenity of the surrounding area. Homes for the aged may also merit special consideration.

#### **Outdoor Advertisements**

Objective 72: An urban environment and rural landscape not disfigured by advertisements.

Objective 73: Advertisements in retail, commercial and industrial urban areas, and centre zones, designed to enhance the appearance of those areas.

Objective 74: Advertisements not hazardous to any person.

#### **Telecommunications Facilities**

Objective 75: Telecommunications facilities provided to meet the needs of the community.

Objective 76: Telecommunications facilities located and designed to minimise visual impact of the amenity of the local environment.

[Add a note on health issues?](#)

[Check current state of science on this.](#)

Telecommunications facilities are an essential infrastructure required to meet the rapidly increasing community demand for communications technologies. To meet this demand there will be a need for new telecommunications facilities to be constructed.

The Commonwealth Telecommunications Act 1997 is pre-eminent in relation to telecommunications facilities. The Telecommunications (Low-impact Facilities) Determination 1997 identifies a range of facilities that are exempt from State planning legislation. The development of low impact facilities to achieve necessary coverage is encouraged in all circumstances where possible to minimise visual impacts on local environments.

Where required, the construction of new facilities is encouraged in preferred industrial and commercial and appropriate non-residential zones. Recognising that new facility development will be unavoidable in more sensitive areas in order to achieve coverage for users of communications technologies, facility design and location in such circumstances must ensure visual impacts on the amenity of local environments are minimised.

#### **Catchment Water Management**

Objective 77: Protection of the quality and quantity of South Australia's surface waters (inland, marine and estuarine) and underground waters.

Surface water<sup>1</sup> (inland, marine, estuarine) and ground water<sup>2</sup> has the potential to be detrimentally affected by waste from development. Protection of water quality should be achieved by avoiding the production of waste, including wastewater, to the maximum extent possible. Where waste is produced, the amount should be minimised as far as is reasonably practicable with waste produced being reused or recycled on site. When these measures have been taken, and there is still waste to be disposed of, treatment to reduce potentially degrading impacts should occur and then finally, as a last option, environmentally sound disposal of the waste should be undertaken.

Objective 78: Development designed, located and managed to prevent or minimise the generation of waste (including wastewater) by applying the following waste management hierarchy in the priority order shown below:

- (a) avoiding waste production;
- (b) minimising waste production;



- (c) reusing waste;
- (d) recycling waste;
- (e) recovering part of the waste for re-use;
- (f) treating waste to reduce potentially degrading impacts; and
- (g) disposing of waste in an environmentally sound manner.

Objective 79: Management and rehabilitation of watercourses flood plains and wetlands to protect and improve:

- (a) water quality;
- (b) flow;
- (c) environmental values and ecological functions of watercourse habitat; and
- (d) the movement or migration of aquatic biota.

Objective 80: Development which:

- (a) ensures surface run-off promotes the restoration of natural flow regimes;
- (b) prevents soil erosion and water pollution;
- (c) protects stormwater from pollution sources;
- (d) protects environmental flows required to meet the needs of the natural environment;
- (e) protects water quality and riparian zone<sup>4</sup> by providing adequate separation distances from watercourses<sup>5</sup>, and other water bodies;
- (f) protects water quality from problems associated with salinity;
- (g) maintains natural hydrological systems and existing indigenous vegetation;
- (h) maintains natural water storage capacity whether temporary or permanent; and
- (i) protects aquifers<sup>6</sup>, particularly recharge zones and their dependent ecosystems<sup>7</sup>.

ADD maximizes local absorption rather than run-off.

Objective 81: Development designed and located to protect or enhance the environmental values<sup>8</sup> of receiving waters.

Objective 82: Watercourses, wetlands and floodplains<sup>9</sup> protected against:

- (a) pollution;
- (b) erosion;
- (c) habitat destruction;
- (d) diversion of, or obstruction to natural stream flow; and
- (e) activities that compromise water quality and ecosystem health.

Objective 83: Protect and enhance native vegetation within and bordering watercourses, wetlands, and floodplains to:

- (a) maintain bed and bank stability;
- (b) protect biodiversity;
- (c) protect habitat;
- (d) maintain water quality;
- (e) minimise downstream flooding; and
- (f) provide ecosystem corridors.

Objective 84: Dams, walls or other water collection or diversion mechanisms constructed and managed in a manner which:

- (a) protects catchment<sup>10</sup> water quality and quantity;
- (b) provides sufficient water during low flow periods for downstream dependent ecosystems;
- (c) allows migration of aquatic biota; and
- (d) protects and enhances amenity.

Objective 85: Integrated stormwater management at the catchment level, drainage system level and

site level including incorporation of water sensitive design<sup>11</sup> in all development.

Objective 86: Storage and/or use of water including treated wastewater and/or imported water<sup>12</sup> which avoids adverse impact on public health, water, soil and their dependent ecosystems.

Objective 87: Design of buildings and places to manage, protect and conserve the urban water cycle through features to retain, detain and re-use stormwater on-site.

Objective 88: Provision of environmental flows to maintain and restore key ecological processes and species dependent on the flow regime of a watercourse.

Objective 89: The sustainable use of natural water resources (including groundwater, surface water and watercourses).

A sustainable urban, peri-urban and rural catchment should maintain and enhance water quality, and demonstrate benefits from the equitable sharing of water resources to maintain a healthy environment.

It is important that at a catchment level, the management of water from source to sea should meet the needs of the community while ensuring that the quantity and quality of all water resources and their dependent ecosystems are improved and maintained now and in the future.

Whilst the River Murray is a primary source of potable water for metropolitan Adelaide, it is important that local water supply catchments are protected and other sources of water are efficiently utilised. Stormwater, groundwater and wastewater are forms of water that subject to best available technology and behaviour can provide the total water resource needs for metropolitan Adelaide for the future.

[Make this relevant to Mt Barker primarily](#)

Solid and liquid wastes must be managed to eliminate pollution of water receiving bodies, and enable the increased use of stormwater for a range of re-use options as well as providing clean environmental flows through watercourses.

The optimisation and smart use of water resources<sup>1</sup> in future development to meet present and future needs are important factors in achieving sustainable water use and environmental improvement.

Water sensitive design integrated into all development achieves a range of environmental, economic and local benefits, including:

- (a) the restoration and/or maintenance of the natural or desired water balance;
- (b) a reduced risk of flooding;
- (c) reduced erosion of waterways, slopes and banks;
- (d) improved water quality of surface and groundwater;
- (e) conservation of water resources;
- (f) reduction in the cost of providing and maintaining water infrastructure;
- (g) restoration and/or protection of aquatic and riparian ecosystems and habitats; and
- (h) restoration and/or protection of the scenic, landscape and recreational values of streams.

Development should seek to prevent site adverse impacts such as erosion during construction, enable stormwater harvesting as part of an area water plan, achieve potential for treated effluent water re-use without adverse health effects or detrimental impacts on natural ecosystems, and ensure that the design, location and management of developments within the catchment will contribute to more sustainable water use and improved water quality.

## Renewable Energy<sup>1</sup>

Objective 90: The development of renewable energy facilities, such as wind and biomass energy facilities, in appropriate locations.

Objective 91: Renewable energy facilities located, sited, designed and operated to avoid or minimise adverse impacts and maximise positive impacts on the environment, local community and the State.

#### **Native Vegetation**

Objective 92: The preservation of trees of historic, local, or particular, visual significance.

Objective 93: Protection, enhancement and re-establishment of indigenous vegetation, including roadside vegetation in a manner which will not increase the risk of bushfires.

Objective 94: The preservation and replanting of roadside vegetation.

Objective 95: The retention of environmentally-significant areas of native vegetation.

Objective 96: The retention of native vegetation where clearance is likely to lead to problems of soil erosion, soil slip and soil salinization, flooding or a deterioration in the quality of surface waters.

Objective 97: The retention of native vegetation for amenity purposes, for livestock shade and shelter, and for the movement of native wildlife.

The retention of large bushland areas, roadside vegetation, and clumps of trees on hilltops, and elsewhere, is important, not only to preserve scenic beauty, but also for wildlife habitats, ecological study, recreation areas, and for the control of soil erosion and water quality.

Steps should be taken to preserve as much of the remaining vegetation as possible and to encourage land owners to set aside, and fence, areas of native vegetation. Encouragement should be given to the replanting of indigenous species as a means of restoring native vegetation to parts of the area. If it is necessary to fell trees of visual significance, replanting should be undertaken wherever practicable.

Objective 98: The conservation and preservation of flora, fauna, and significant areas of bushland.

Objective 99: The conservation of significant trees that provide important aesthetic and environment benefit.

Objective 100: The conservation of significant trees should occur in balance with achieving appropriate development, while avoiding the indiscriminate and inappropriate removal of significant trees.