



DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES, SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Agronomy Branch Report

THE CONTROL OF PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS
OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Murray V. Smith and Ian R. Lewis

The summary and recommendations of this discussion paper was prepared for the Director of the South Australian Department of Agriculture and Fisheries as a basis for a proposed departmental submission to the Hart Inquiry into the Control of Private Development in South Australia.

Report No. Number 96

JANUARY 1978.

---TABLE OF CONTENTS---

	<u>Page</u>
Summary and Recommendations:	i
1. History of Private Development of Rural Land Use in South Australia.	1
2. Current Factors Influencing Private Development in Rural Areas.	2
2.1 Government Controls	2
2.2 Decline of Rural Sector	2
2.3 Other Sectors of the Economy	3
2.4 Urban Growth	3
2.5 Changing Community Attitudes	3
2.6 Demand for Near-Urban Living	4
3. The Future of Agriculture in South Australia.	5
4. Community Objectives in Controlling Private Development of Rural Lands	7
5. Farmers' Requirements in Legislation Affecting the Private Development of Rural Lands.	9
6. Protection of Rural Lands from Private Development.	11
6.1 Residual Bushland	11
6.2 Prime Agricultural Land	12
6.3 Multiple Use Land	12
7. Effectiveness of Current Land Use and Land Subdivision Controls	14
7.1 Current Situation	14
7.1.1 Regulatory Approach	15
7.1.2 Subdivision Control on Freehold Land	15
7.1.3 Conditions on Leasehold Land	16
7.1.4 Implementation Problems	17
7.2 Suggested Changes.	20
7.2.1 Rural Planning in Complex and Dynamic Areas	20
7.2.2 Rural Planning in Distant Areas	25
8. The Effectiveness of Communication of Planning Policies to the Community, especially the Rural Community.	28
9. Public Participation in Planning.	29
9.1 Representative Community Opinion	29
9.2 Other Issues	30
10. Involvement of the South Australian Department of Agriculture and Fisheries in Planning.	32
10.1 Should Department of Agriculture and Fisheries be involved in Planning?	32
10.2 The Existing And Past Involvement of SADAF in Planning	32
10.3 Future Involvement of SADAF in Planning	36
11. References Cited.	38

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS - SUGGESTED SUBMISSION TO THE INQUIRY INTO THE
CONTROL OF PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

Summary

Agriculture and land use is continually evolving in Australia. Development of the Australian economy creates market forces which continue to reduce the numbers of workers in agriculture. Near major urban areas there is a continuing and apparently increasing demand for rural living etc. - apparently as an escape reaction to the problems of urban development, increasing affluence and an increased emphasis on the 'quality of life'. Development of rural areas in urban vicinities should be guided to maximise the net social benefit to the community in the long term, but every effort must be made to ensure that the costs of such guidance (e.g. controls on development) is borne by the community at large and not by the long term residents of these near-urban areas.

Rural planning is still very much in its infancy. Planners have a poor knowledge and understanding of such complex and dynamic situations as the rural-urban fringe. Methods of implementing rural planning objectives are not well developed and have been generally ineffective. Planners have major problems in defining the communities planning objectives for rural areas. A clearer understanding of these is essential. As well planners have problems in defining subjective concepts such as "amenity" which form the basic framework of many planning decisions at the implementation level.

Farmers want minimal interference and controls (within broad environmental guidelines) to allow development of their properties to meet changing market circumstances.

The increasing demand for rural land by urban people must be recognised and steps taken to cater for it. If areas of residual bushland and prime agricultural land are to be retained and protected from further development, the remaining lands between these extremes will be the ones with multiple use (including rural living) and where the pressures for change are greatest.

Controls on minimum allotment sizes tend to accelerate rather than retard the diversion of land from primary production to other uses i.e. such legislation is generally inefficient and counter productive in what it was set out to achieve. More consideration needs to be given to the exercising of controls direct on building development rather than via subdivision limits. This applies particularly to areas such as the Adelaide Hills and Southern Vales that have already been intensively subdivided.

The use of the concept of "independent economic units" as a method of evaluating subdivision proposals under 30 ha is unsatisfactory. The concept of transferable development rights (TDR) separates development rights from land use and ownership rights. With TDR the concept of "independent economic units" as currently used for subdivisions under 30 ha will become largely irrelevant in complex and dynamic rural areas such as the Adelaide Hills. This is because subdivision controls are currently being used to control development. Similarly the concept of minimum allotment sizes which is also used as a subdivision control will become largely irrelevant. The potential of TDR as a policy implementation

tool for near urban areas should be closely investigated.

The current procedure of public involvement and participation tends to favour the more vocal members and organisations in the community resulting in an imbalance of opinion. There needs to be a concerted effort to seek out the opinions of landholders through social survey (personal interview) to seek a more balanced overview of opinions of the whole community.

Involvement of SADAF in planning

In view of the infancy of planning skills in rural areas (c.f. urban areas) it is likely that SADAF will need to make a major contributions in the following areas.

- i) Planning policy - e.g. defining objectives and the use of concepts such as "amenity".
- ii) Evaluation of effects of policy options.
- iii) Evaluation of effectiveness of implementation techniques.
- iv) Technical capacity e.g.
 - . land use capability surveys
 - . to act as expert witnesses for the Crown in Planning Appeal Board cases involving agricultural lands - a last resort rather than routine involvement.

1. The Future of Agriculture in South Australia

- . Agriculture is in an adjustment phase with the rural sector continuing to decline in relative importance in the Australian economy. Economic pressures (rising costs and declining or steady prices) have continued to erode the profitability of farming. There is an overall decline in the number of farmers, generally resulting in increasing farm sizes to benefit from economics of scale and the substitution of capital for labour through mechanisation. Marginal areas may continue to adjust out of agriculture - both livestock and cropping areas.
- . Increasing mining revenue will further reduce Australia's dependence on rural products for overseas income to balance payments. As well, unless Australia can regain its competitive advantage over other rural exporting countries, then its rural industries are likely to adjust towards supplying the home market alone. This seems particularly likely with the more labour and hence cost intensive industries, such as the horticulture and dairy industries.
- . The overall net effect of State and Federal Government economic policies is to discourage rural production and to encourage the manufacturing and tertiary sectors which results in continued urban growth and affluence. This is the current net effect of existing protection due to tariffs, subsidies, market quotas, fuel pricing policies, etc. Without positive government incentives to reverse these pressures, there will be a continuing decline in relative investment in agriculture.
- . This decline of the rural sector will be reversed in part by the demand from urban people for rural land within reasonable proximity of Adelaide and other cities and major towns for rural living, recreational and conservation purposes. Such a process of evolution in land use will continue at a rate affected by a multitude of factors ranging from government policies to the effects of weather on crop production in the Northern Hemisphere.
- . There are some examples of increasing Government support for agriculture in South Australia e.g.
 - the Rural Industry Assistance section of SADAF aims at helping (largely via financing) the process of rural adjustment.
 - Market intelligence and development e.g. for pasture seeds, farm machinery.
- . It is essential that governments, planners and developers as well as agriculturalists recognise the continuing evolution of agriculture and land use in South Australia. Governments, planners and agriculturists have a most important role to play to ensure that such an evolution is guided in a way that maximises net social benefit, while ensuring that the costs are not borne by a minority group e.g. traditional rural dwellers and producers.

2. Factors Influencing Private Development of Rural Lands in S.A.

- . For the purposes of this submission
 - rural lands are any non-urban or non-industrial lands and not subjected to mining.
 - private development is the change of land use of the whole or portion of a rural holding and initiated by a private individual e.g. owner, sharefarmer, lessee. Development infers a higher land use (e.g. from grazing to cropping, horticulture or intensive animals or the clearing of residual bushland areas or the building of structures on any portion of a rural holding). It must be emphasized that in rural areas land use may also revert, decline or rundown (e.g. for reasons such as prices of labour or commodities or other comparative advantages such as slopes and water supplies). In rural areas the consideration of private development should also include the potential for decline, reversion or rundown to a lower land use.
- . With the rural sector declining in relative importance, the resultant pressures on the private development of land for agricultural purposes are not great. However in particular localities there may be strong pressures (e.g. in the Lower South East where grazing land may be developed for winegrapes or vegetable growing).
- . The net effect of farm adjustment will depend largely on the distance of rural areas from major urban centres. In areas distant from urban centres, there are losses of population, desertion of homes, etc. The remaining farmers will purchase other farms and so expand the size of their holding. This may result in reduced amenity (defined in the Planning and Development Act "as such quality or condition in an area or locality as contributes to its pleasantness and harmony and to its better enjoyment") due to fewer people maintaining buildings and their surroundings and land in reasonable condition. Such effects will be most marked in marginal farming areas e.g. on Eyre Peninsula and in the Murray Mallee - large areas may go completely out of cereal production. In near urban rural areas (e.g. Adelaide Hills, River Murray and selected coastal areas), there have been counteracting forces - urban people have been keenly buying land for residential, recreational and conservational uses. Such purchases have usually been at prices far in excess of that which most farmers would be prepared to pay for the land for agricultural production. Urban people have tended to be disenchanted with city life and increasingly are preferring the apparently more appealing rural environment. Bonafide full-time farmers are declining in these near urban areas, but the overall regional population is increasing due to the influx of urban people. Increased numbers of dwellings and the frequent problems of land management (steep agricultural lands with weed control problems and owners often inexperienced in land management) may result in reduced amenity.

- . Various government controls do affect the private development of rural lands. These include
 - . the Planning and Development Act with a minimum rural subdivision limit of 30 ha has resulted in many lands being subdivided into allotments of this size.
 - . controls over the appearance (especially external colour) of buildings.
 - . The Crown Lands Act and supporting legislation determines rental and conditions for leasehold rural areas and hence may have a major effect on private development.
 - . estate taxes.
 - . Water Works Act controlling intensive animal uses in particular districts.
 - . Urban Land Price Control may have diverted land speculation into near urban rural areas.
 - . Water Resources Act.
 - . The Soil Conservation Act can restrict the clearance of natural vegetations on areas prone to erosion.

3. Community Objectives in Controlling Private Development of Rural Land

Rural planning is still very much in its infancy.

The rural situations that may need particular planning attention are those complex and dynamic ones that exist in the multiple use areas near Adelaide and our country cities and major towns. The interface between rural and urban societies is the situation where change is greatest. Little attempt has been made by the planners to survey community opinion to determine planning objectives for these areas. This would seem to be a necessary prerequisite to ensure that current and future planning policies and objectives have the strong support of the majority of the community and not just a vocal minority. As a result of poorly defined community planning objectives, the lack of understanding and information about multiple use rural areas, and the lack of implementation techniques specifically designed for rural situations, the planners approach has often been to leave open as many options as possible for future development. While this may not be a bad thing it is not an excuse for ill-defined community planning objectives.

Notwithstanding this lack of community information, there would appear to be several recent changes in community attitudes and lifestyles that need to be reflected in changed planning objectives. These changes include an increased emphasis on the 'quality of life', an increasing disposable income, increased time for recreation and a growing awareness of the importance of greenspace on urban fringes. The effects of these changes include disillusionment with city life, increased demand for rural residential living, increased time devoted to recreational activities and an increased conservation orientation aimed at preserving open space,

bushland and farmland areas in or near cities. These open space or greenspace areas are claimed to be areas of high amenity.

All involved with planning and implementation must recognise that there is a continuing evolution of both urban and rural societies and that change is likely to be greatest at the interface of the two. Planners should (can) only define the broad directions in which development (evolution) can proceed.

The definition of "amenity" present planners with a major problem because it is such a subjective concept. Planners need to give more attention to the determination of what the community defines as "amenity". This is important because what determines "amenity" forms the basic framework of many planning decisions at the implementation level.

4. Farmers Requirements in Legislation Affecting the Private Development of Rural Lands

- . Controls should not restrict the development of any technology in any agricultural industry i.e. minimal Government interference subject to constraints of broad environmental guidelines. Rural producers generally wish to be able to continue economic production with a minimum of interference relating to the control of development on a particular property e.g. restriction of agricultural land use to particular crops through zoning is most undesirable.
- . A sound and stable environment in which to invest/expand their farming business e.g. purchase more land, build extra house for son or workman as needed.
- . Urban demand for near-urban rural land such as the Adelaide Hills places increasing pressures on farmers in these areas e.g. higher land values and ratings, pressures for subdivision etc. Current planning policies suggest that the community places high amenity/tourist values on established rural production areas near major urban centres. If these rural producers are to be encouraged to remain for amenity reasons then incentives will be necessary e.g. land tax and rate (e.g. E.W.S. and Local Government) concessions - additionally and most importantly traditional producers must not be excluded from sharing in any gains arising from increased demand for rural land.

5. Protection of Land from Private Development

- . The preservation of particular lands (e.g. bushland or prime agricultural land) from further development is difficult to justify using economic or agricultural criteria. However a case can also be made on the basis that such lands have high amenity value.
- . The community having recognised a need to retain high amenity areas, (e.g. natural bushland or prime agricultural land) must further recognise that costs are involved in achieving such benefits. Further, the community must be made to realise that the costs involved should be borne by the community at large and

not by any minority group - particularly not by traditional agricultural producers or long term rural dwellers.

- . If areas of residual bushland and prime agricultural land are to be retained and protected from further development, the remaining lands will be the ones with multiple use (including rural residential living) and where the pressures for change are greatest. If such areas are to be subject to more stringent planning, then the most significant decisions for the multiple use areas to be made by planners will relate to the number of building permits to be allowed. Current planning policies suggest that amenity value to the community is inversely related to the building intensity. The alternatives appear to be:-
 - retain the status quo - allow rural adjustment and urban demand to respond to normal market forces.
 - attempt to satisfy/regulate the demand for rural living i.e. allocate planned hobby farming or rural living areas.
 - preclude any further development i.e. no further buildings subdivision or resubdivision.

It is the success of defining how development should proceed in these multiple use areas that holds the key to successful planning of near-urban areas of South Australia. A key to any planning should be that no established agricultural producers should be forced out of business more quickly than they would otherwise as a result of not being in a prime agricultural area unless his area is a key area in a proposed rural living area for example - when he should be readily compensated. Thus, he should have rate, etc., incentives retained/implemented if he wishes to remain in agricultural production in a multiple land use area.

- . If any marked change in policy affecting land use occurs in regard to near-urban development than it is most important that the implications of such decisions are fully realized e.g. effect on weeds, bushfires, fauna, alternative agricultural production areas or recreation land - SADF has important contributions to such policy considerations.

6. Effectiveness of Current Land Use and Land Subdivision Controls of Rural Land Under the Planning and Development Act

- . Planning objectives for rural lands are based on the following key principles (stated particularly for the Mt. Lofty Ranges).
 - The rural character, scenic amenity and bushland of the Ranges should be conserved.
 - The subdivision of rural land should only be permitted if it can be shown that the resulting allotments are large enough to form an economic unit for the business of primary production.

- As much rural land as possible should be retained in primary production.

Current Implementation

- . At least two distinct rural situations need to be recognised from a planning viewpoint. Close to Adelaide and cities and major towns in the country, land use is complex and dynamic due to major urban influences as well as factors directly affecting agricultural production. In areas distant from urban centres land use is more stable being affected only by factors directly affecting agricultural production.
- . Subdivision regulations are being used to control development of private rural land. A number of problems can be highlighted with the current subdivision control regulations as they affect rural land, viz:-
 - The use of a minimum lot size of 30 ha has resulted in much farming land being divided up into allotments of this particular size. Such an allotment size is a waste of land resources as it is generally too large for the buyer's requirements in the case of rural retreats or too small for economic primary production unless some form of horticulture is intended. Both here and in other states (e.g. N.S.W.) it has been demonstrated that controls on minimum allotment sizes tend to accelerate rather than retard the diversion of land from primary production to other uses, i.e. such legislation is generally inefficient and counter productive in what it was set out to achieve. Whatever is the minimum allotment size for the subdivision of rural land within reasonable proximity to an urban populus tends to become the "desirable" size for a rural retreat. Also any controls on minimum allotment size probably bear little relationship to the existing pattern of subdivision and could therefore divert attention from other more appropriate forms of development control.

- * More consideration needs to be given to the exercising of controls direct on building development rather than via subdivision limits!

By using minimum allotment sizes, this means that there is no control over the land use carried out on allotments of this size and greater. Currently subdivision tends to be considered before land use. Subdivision should only apply after the generally desired future use and character has been decided on. Current pressures on allotment size generates purely from the inherent implied rights to build a dwelling on each allotment.

- * The use of the concept of "independent economic unit" (as defined in Section 70A) as a basis for rural subdivisions under 30 ha is an unsatisfactory one in practice. This is fraught with problems because:-

- # varying financial requirements and lifestyle of prospective purchasers
- # average values used to define "minimum economic units" do not take account of the wide range of values which may occur - also wide range in managerial skills.
- # "minimum economic unit" may vary with enterprise, market conditions, changing technology, rising production costs.
- # no enforced relationships of actual land use to proposed land use.

Proposed Improved Implementation

- . Problems in general in planning arise not with overall objectives, but rather at the implementation stage. A possible sequential procedure to achieve planning objectives in complex and dynamic areas within say 160 km of Adelaide will be to use existing land use maps, land use capability and social and economic survey information from the planning area to develop a structure plan to delineate "sub-districts", "zones" or "policy areas". Using this information, desired future character statements and plans can be developed for each policy area in each district. Final implementation will be via action plans and proposals and guideline documents for specific activities or uses. At present the SPA has produced Model Planning Regulations. This document has a very comprehensive zoning basis - many would consider excessive zoning, and will not necessarily achieve policy objectives.
- . While zoning has many problems, it would seem that any non-arbitrary form of control of private development must involve some form of zoning - the zones may be referred to in some preferred terminology such as "policy areas", "planning regions" or "sub-districts". Mechanisms must be sought to remedy any inequities that will result from the determination of zone boundaries.
- . If rational planning is to be achieved in complex and dynamic areas, such as the Adelaide Hills and the Southern Vales that have already been intensively subdivided, then attention needs to be focused directly on controls on building development. This is particularly so in the Adelaide Hills where a large pool of residual development rights exists because of the large number of undeveloped allotments throughout the area. Controls over building rights will be essential to achieve the desired future character in particular "policy areas". A number of implementation tools should be considered for their effectiveness e.g. transferable development rights, single tenement policy, consolidation and re-arrangement of allotments, cluster housing on farms and agreements.
- . In key areas of the Adelaide Hills (e.g. Piccadilly Valley) or say the Willunga area of the Southern Vales, Transferable Development Rights together with a single tenement policy and

agreements would appear to be a more effective and desirable policy. Many other implementation tool options would be less satisfactory in key policy areas because of the increased number of dwellings, e.g. cluster housing on farms. However such proposals would be eminently better than the current situation.

- . If development rights are separated from land use and ownership rights, then subdivision controls in terms of minimum allotment sizes will become largely irrelevant in complex and dynamic rural areas such as the Adelaide Hills. This is because subdivision controls are currently being used to control development. Similarly the concept of "independent economic units" as currently used for subdivisions under 30 ha will also be irrelevant.
- . With land not possessing a development right, some criteria may need to be developed to decide on what basis, if any, further subdivision of land will be allowed.

7. The Effectiveness of Communication of the Government's Planning Policies to the Community, Especially the Rural Community

- . The rural community's understanding of the Government's current planning policies is generally poor because of:
 - inadequate public involvement and participation in the planning process
 - "Client orientation" involving skilled professionals is required. Problems arise of whose opinions should count e.g. existing dwellers or others - possibility of giving weightings - on what basis?
 - Planning documents are not presented in a form that fosters a clear communication of concepts, ideas and policies to the lay public - planning documents should use clear language and more use should be made of graphics and other techniques.
 - A general mistrust of Government organizations that make important decisions affecting the planning of a particular region and yet these organisations are not represented locally at the regional level. Department of Housing Urban and Regional Affairs should be regionalised to make their officers more accessible to the rural public.

8. Public Participation in Planning

- . There needs to be a concerted effort to seek out the opinions of landholders through social survey (personal interview) and other methods to obtain a more balanced overview of opinions (representative opinions) of the whole community. The current procedure of public involvement participation tends to favour the more vocal members and organizations in the community resulting in an imbalance of opinion. Greater public participation could lead to a better understanding and more accurate definition of "amenity".

- . An increased level of education re planning is necessary for both urban and rural people. This could be achieved by
 - encouraging urban - rural discussion e.g. press articles, workshops, radio/T.V. discussions and debate.
 - ensuring both urban and rural people are kept aware of the evolution of urban and rural societies e.g. Kellogg Rural Adjustment Unit.
 - fostering recognition of the value of land of high amenity and the costs involved in maintaining/retaining it.

However there is no guarantee that either the government, the planners or the majority of people know what is in the best long term interests of society as a whole - hence the major planning problem and a need for continuing discussion and review of objectives.

9. Involvement of SADAF in Planning

- . Recent policy statements of SADAF's objectives suggest that the Department has an important interest and involvement in the development of rural lands and factors affecting the viability of farmers. In view of the infancy of planning skills in rural areas (c.f. urban areas) it is likely that SADAF will need to make major contributions.
- . Since 1973, there has been a progressively increased contribution and involvement by SADAF in planning. During this time there has also be a greater liaison between SPO and SADAF staff and good working relationships have developed along with a better understanding of each others roles and activities.
- . Concern is particularly expressed over the SADAF's current involvement with the continued use of the concept of "independent economic unit" as a basis for the control of subdivision of rural land into allotments of less than 30 ha.
- . Particular areas in which the SADAF should make significant contributions to the planning process are -
 - (1) Planning policy involvement
 - to be involved in working parties, task forces etc. that may be set up to look into planning in rural areas. The current difficulties arising from the use of "amenity" as a planning criteria should be examined and alternatives sought.
 - (2) Evaluation of effects of various policy options
 - an evaluation of the effects of planning proposals on rural people and the economics, management and production of food and fibres from their properties.

(3) Evaluation of Effectiveness of Implementation Techniques

- to suggest and evaluate planning techniques and tools that may be particularly suited for use in rural areas to achieve stated objectives e.g. transferable development rights, cluster houses on farms etc.

(4) Technical expertise

- assist in land use capability survey work and hence in the defining of land use potentials in key areas of land use conflict.
- aid environmental quality e.g. minimizing the effects of livestock.
- preparation of agricultural activity guideline documents.
- to act as expert witnesses for the Crown in Planning Appeal Board cases involving agricultural lands - a last resort rather than routine involvement.

1. HISTORY OF PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL LAND USE IN
SOUTH AUSTRALIA

In the preparation of this discussion paper, certain key terms required definition to clarify the scope and extent of the investigation.

Rural lands are defined, as any non-urban or non-industrial lands and which are not subjected to mining.

Private development is defined as the change of land use of the whole or portion of a rural holding and initiated by a private individual e.g. owner, sharefarmer, lessee. Development infers a higher land use (e.g. from grazing to cropping, horticulture or intensive animals or the clearing of bushland areas or the building of structures on any portion of a rural holding). It must be emphasized that in rural areas land use may also revert, decline or run-down (e.g. for reasons such as prices of labour or commodities or other comparative advantages such as potential for mechanization or water supplies). Thus in rural areas the consideration of private development also includes the potential for decline, reversion or rundown to a lower land use.

Private development is least affected on freehold land. Less than 7% of the land area of South Australia is freehold. That area, however, contains much of the fertile soils with reliable rainfall suitable for cropping and/or grazing. The alienation of these lands from the Crown started soon after the settlement of South Australia in 1836 and for many years was a major source of public revenue.

Public funds have been used for rural development e.g. in War Service Land Settlement Schemes which were subjected to Crown leases which control future private development. Grazing leases, occupy over 60% of the land area of South Australia, thus allowing public control of a large area of low rainfall, low carrying capacity grazing land.

It is the freehold land in South Australia which has been subject to the great majority of development, whether in urban or rural areas. Private development may occur on leasehold land in rural areas, but it is controlled to some extent by the conditions of the lease, level of rents, etc.

Traditionally the control of private development of rural lands has been minimal, resulting frequently in what many consider as over-clearing of vegetation. The scope for further private development by way of clearing in South Australia is severely limited by lack of suitable land. Hence for the last 30-40 years South Australia has had a short supply of rural land suitable for development and many South Australian farmers have expanded their farming operations by moving interstate, e.g. Western Australia or New South Wales. Even in the 1870's the shortage of good farming land in South Australia restricted development. The other effect of these pressures for additional farming land has been the bidding up of land values well in excess of their agriculture production value - particularly in the most reliable farming areas within reasonable distance of major urban centres.

2. CURRENT FACTORS INFLUENCING PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT IN RURAL AREAS

2.1 Government Controls

The Planning and Development Act has aimed at retaining/improving the amenity of rural landscapes, and restricting subdivision of rural lands into small allotments, while at the same time encouraging retention of established agriculture. Major effects of these controls in rural areas have been

- . minimum subdivision limit of 30 ha has resulted in many lands being subdivided into allotments of this size.
- . control over appearance of buildings (especially colour of exterior surface).

On leasehold rural lands the Crown Lands Act has a major effect on land use via terms and conditions of leases and level of annual rentals.

Estate taxes both State and Federal have been an increasing burden on established farmers particularly at intergenerational transfer.

Local government rates and land taxes have been increasing costs for most bona fide rural producers.

The Soil Conservation Act can restrict the clearance of natural vegetation on areas prone to erosion.

Urban land price control policy may have focused land speculation into urban/rural fringe areas outside of metropolitan area.

The Water Resources Act controls development in several ways viz.:

- . assessment of water resources including issue of permits for well construction.
- . controls withdrawals from aquifers in proclaimed areas e.g. Northern Adelaide Plains and Padthaway basin.
- . licenses diversions from proclaimed water courses, e.g. River Murray.
- . controls water quality by authorization of waste discharge.

The Waterworks Act controls water quality by controlling land use in water storage catchment areas e.g. control by zoning of intensive animal production units. This Act also regulates the reticulation of water - both urban and rural.

Numerous other State legislation has had a minor effect on private development of rural lands, e.g. Country Fires Act, Pest Plants Act, Rural Industry Assistance Acts, etc.

2.2 Decline of Rural Sector

The rural sector of the Australian economy and the South Australian economy is declining in relative importance. Since the mid 1960's expansion of agriculture throughout Australia has been halted. The relative prosperity of rural people has been declining since the mid 1950's. Continuing adjustment pressures have occurred on the rural sector. Horticultural, dairy and beef industries have been forced into

major adjustment. Cropping industries have been less severely affected, but their international competitiveness has been eroded and lower prices and/or droughts will see major adjustment in these industries.

In this situation agriculture is in an adjustment phase, and pressures on private development are not great. Rather the problem from the community's or planner's point of view may be one of reduced amenity due to fewer people in rural areas maintaining buildings, gardens, plantations or reasonable land management.

Thus while there is a shortage of good farming land in South Australia, general economic pressures have continued to erode the profitability of rural production (except for a brief fillip in 1973 and 1974) and hence reduce the demand for farm land. While farmers may be annoyed, for example, by proposed restrictions on land clearing, the fact remains that there is not a great demand for more private development in terms of land clearing. This has also been aided by removal of land development taxation incentives. Further agricultural development continues to be increasingly dependent on capital and hence land is becoming a relatively less important factor in rural production.

2.3 Other Sections Of The Economy

While economic pressures have resulted in the decline of the rural sector, this has been taken up by expansion in the minerals and service sectors of the economy. The manufacturing sector of import-competing industries has also been subject to economic pressures, but adjustment has not occurred to a comparable extent to rural industries because of relatively high levels of protection, e.g. tariffs, market quotas.

2.4 Urban Growth

There have been few pressures preventing continued urban growth and affluence. However, there are signs of increasing disenchantment of urban society with its problems and restrictions, e.g. transport, lack of open spaces. In recent years this has resulted in increasing pressures from urban dwellers to push the causes of conservation, or for the more wealthy to buy a "few hectares in the country" and become rural retreaters, commuters, or just rural dwellers. The motor vehicle and urban affluence have allowed such dreams to frequently become reality and have put increasing pressures on near-urban traditional agricultural land to be used for other purposes.

The present effect of the total policies of government at all levels is to discourage rural production and rural living due to rural industries being protected to a level of about 10%, while urban industries and workers are protected to a level of about 30%. Without positive government incentives to reverse the pressures forcing rural people to the cities and the increasing relative affluence of urban dwellers compared with rural dwellers, there will be a continuing and probably increasing demand from urban dwellers for near-urban land ownership.

2.5 Changing Community Attitudes e.g. Conservation, Management Problems

Other factors also related to the relative urban affluence have aided the urban demand for rural land. Apparent disenchantment with traditional landowner's management plus a conservationist's philosophy has meant that considerable areas of the undeveloped Adelaide Hills have been bought by private urban dwellers, either for living or conservation purposes. The increasing awareness of conservation instilled in today's population has many benefits, but often the understanding of issues is very superficial so that many conservation

attitudes, are counter productive either from a conservation or agricultural point of view.

For example, the management requirement for old agricultural areas is high, for weed, vermin and fire control. Seldom are conservationists willing to carry out such control or continue to pay for it in the longer term. It must be recognised that there will be poor land management to some extent, whether land is owned by urban people or traditional primary producers. Continuing education for all classes of land managers will aid this problem and seems the most realistic way for the community to influence land management. Alternatively, specific management goals may be achieved by subsidising the cost of management inputs, e.g. fencing, pest plant control.

2.6 Demand For Near-Urban Living

The possible future reasons for a reduction in demand of rural living, should be considered. Increased travelling costs are likely to be most important. Reduced population growth rates, higher costs of services, rates, taxes, and further realisation of the costs and problems of managing such areas are other possible reasons.

Overall, however, it is difficult to imagine greatly reduced demand for near-urban living. Such demand may be manipulated by the provision and cost of services, and such areas are important considerations for Government policy.

3. THE FUTURE OF AGRICULTURE IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The pressures that have resulted in the decline of the rural sector in Australia over the last twenty years show few signs of abating in the short-medium term. Increasing development of the mining sector will compete with agriculture for development funds. Increasing mining revenue will further reduce the dependence of Australia on rural products for overseas income. Manufacturing industries will also be pressed by such forces, but because of problems of more people involved and hence effects on unemployment and votes, manufacturing is likely to be better protected from the adjustment pressures.

Unless Australia can regain its competitive advantage over other rural exporting countries, then its rural industry is likely to adjust towards supplying the home market alone. This seems particularly likely with the more labour and hence cost intensive industries, such as horticulture and dairying. More efficient industries (on a cost per unit of production basis) such as the wool, grains and meat industries, will continue to supply overseas markets at levels of profitability determined by overseas factors. These products will be subject to large price/demand fluctuations and hence adjustments will continue in periods of stress, e.g. climatic or price. Increasingly large businesses with high capital availability and good management will be required. Fewer and fewer traditional rural producers will be able to meet these requirements.

It may be possible to reduce or reverse such trends in the rural sector by active Government involvement in some forms of rural support. Because of lack of votes in rural areas and because the issue seems to have very limited urban appeal, the chances of large scale rural support measures seem remote. There are some examples however of increasing Government support for agriculture in South Australia e.g.

- the Rural Industry Assistance section of SADAFA aims at helping (largely via financing) the process of rural adjustment.
- Market intelligence and development e.g. for pasture seeds, live-stock and farm machinery by SADAFA.

South Australia can do little to insulate itself from these overall Australian factors. Hence the relative decline of the rural sector seems likely to continue, and the extent of this adjustment and the demand for traditional rural land and homes will largely depend on urban demand. Thus the closer the rural area is to larger urban centres (particularly Adelaide) the greater will be the demand for areas traditionally used for rural production.

From the State Planning Authority amenity* point of view, the countryside is likely to continue to deteriorate. Thus with fewer families on farms and in rural towns, there will be less effort put into maintaining a picturesque rural setting, i.e. less landscaping, care of buildings, etc. The cold economic forces of the cost:price squeeze will ensure this. Functional ability must dominate rather than aesthetics under such pressures. Incentives of some form are necessary if the Government is to maintain or improve rural amenity. Counteracting this

* Amenity is defined in the Planning and Development Act "as such quality or condition in an area or locality as contributes to its pleasantness and harmony and to its better enjoyment".

will be the demand from urban dwellers. The closer the land used for rural production is to larger urban centres (particularly Adelaide), the greater will be the demand from non-traditional rural users, i.e. the greater the number of alternative uses. From an amenity point of view it is not clear whether many urban owners will result in an improvement or loss - although traditionally this has been considered a loss of amenity.

In summary the total effect of Government policies will be a continuing decline in investment in agricultural relative to non-agricultural investment. Some of this effect will be reversed however by the demand from urban people for rural land for purposes other than traditional agricultural production. Such a process of evolution in land use will continue at a rate affected by a multitude of factors ranging from government policies to the effects of weather on the crop production in the Northern Hemisphere.

It is essential that governments, planners and developers as well as agriculturalists recognise the continuing evolution of agriculture and land use in South Australia, and recognise that it will continue to occur and that governments, planners, developers and agriculturalists have a most important role to play to ensure that such evolution is guided in a way that maximizes net social benefit, while ensuring that the costs are not borne by a minority group e.g. traditional rural dwellers and producers.

4. COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES IN CONTROLLING PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL LANDS

Land resources, either singly or in combination form the base of economic exploitation in agriculture, forestry, mining, urban and industrial development. Thus land-use planning is concerned with the optimisation for community purposes of desired land uses which may in themselves be competing.

The most desired areas of land are those which are of such quality that they are suitable for a number of uses. Unfortunately, it is precisely these areas, near centres of population that are liable to alienation for urban use.

The planner in attempting to implement community planning objectives, places controls on the development of land. Unfortunately the community's objectives are often not clearly defined and they may be in conflict with one another. As well the implementation of planning objectives is often very difficult and not very effective for various reasons. Hence the whole-planning process becomes confused to the community at large and the planner is increasingly in a difficult dilemma. This is particularly the case in rural areas near cities and large towns. These are complex and dynamic situations which are inadequately understood and planners are unable to predict important second generation effects. Dr. J. Pullen in "Greenspace and the Cities" highlights "It cannot be assumed the expertise in the design of suburban subdivisions will qualify one to carry out rural subdivisions There has been a long history of discussion, publication and teaching of the art of designing suburban subdivisions. The corresponding art of designing rural subdivisions is still in its infancy".

It would appear that a clearer understanding and definition of the community's planning objectives for rural areas, increased information and understanding about the complexity of these areas, along with planning techniques that are more suited to the rural situation, would go a long way to solving some of the current dilemmas.

In relation to the community's planning objectives affecting the private development of rural lands, there has been little attempt to survey community opinion on this matter. This would seem to be a necessary pre-requisite to ensure that current and future planning policies and objectives have the strong support of the majority of the community - both the silent majority and the vocal minority.

Notwithstanding this lack of community information, there would appear to be several recent changes in community attitudes and lifestyles that need to be reflected in changed planning objectives. These changes include an increased emphasis on the 'quality of life', an increasing disposable income, increased time for recreation, and a growing awareness of the importance of 'green space' at urban fringes. The effects of these changes include disillusionment with city life, increased rural residential living, increased time devoted to recreational activities and an increased conservation orientation in relation to the preservation of open space bushland and farmland areas in or near cities. These open space or greenspace areas are generally areas of high amenity. There would appear to be an increasing need for greenspace for the urban-locked community for their health, recreation, relaxation, education and enjoyment.

The Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the National Estate outlined the need to give high priority to :-

- ". protect important natural areas and their associated wildlife.
- . protect prime agricultural land in rural areas on the fringes of cities.
- . protect catchments from damaging uses.
- . withdraw vulnerable marginal land from production for other uses.
- . provide recreation areas.
- . identify the most suitable areas for urban growth and new cities."

In looking at these priority land uses, Dr. R.G. Downes, in an address to an Australian Conservation Foundation Symposium, warned against regarding any one of these (and other land use requirements such as food, fibre, timber, water, industry, roads, railways, mineral production etc.) uses as pre-eminent. Dr. Downes went on to say that each of these uses of land is important for the welfare of the community. He believes that apart from those required for subsistence no use is inherently more important than others. Although the relative importance of these various uses may change from time to time, it is wrong to assume that any one should have undoubted pre-eminence for all time.

The Federal Government Green Paper on "Rural Policy in Australia" sees land use patterns being generated primarily by the market with controls as necessary for public purposes. Tempering the market forces may be the acceptance of the belief that :-

"the owner of land is simply a steward of that land for all generations and hence should be responsible for maintaining its physical condition."

In summary, increased effort needs to be given to more accurately determining and defining the community's planning objectives, especially as it relates to the development of rural lands near the urban fringes. There must be recognition of the continuing evolution of both rural and urban societies and that planning objectives and implementation techniques will need to respond to and reflect these dynamic situations.

5. FARMERS' REQUIREMENTS IN LEGISLATION AFFECTING THE PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL LANDS

Farmers' requirements may be diverse and often conflicting. However, several general statements or objectives would appear to be applicable for most of the State's farmers, viz:-

- . Controls should not unnecessarily restrict the development of any technology in any agricultural industry. Adoption of new technology is essential to maintain competitiveness on world markets and to keep prices to consumers relatively low. On the other side adoption of technology is usually capital intensive, and hence results in displacement of rural owners/workers.
- . To be able to continue economic production with a minimum of interference relating to the control of development on a particular property. Should, however, the community deem that particular controls are necessary for their particular benefit rather than the owner's then it would seem reasonable that the community should have to bear the necessary costs of these controls, e.g. retention of bushland areas.

Similarly, it is unreasonable for farmers (particularly those in the fringe areas of Adelaide) to have to bear the extra costs associated with increased urbanisation and subsequent provision of services for which the farmer has no need, e.g. payment of water rates as a result of the installation of a reticulated water system past the bona fide farmer's property even though he has no need for such a service. It is reasonable for the users of such an uneconomic service to bear the majority of the costs associated with its installation.

- . It is unrealistic and impractical to restrict agricultural land use (through zoning) to specific crops when one considers the changing nature of the market place and other economic factors. Rather, broad categories of land use should be used, e.g. horticulture to include all forms of intensive plant production from floriculture to market gardens to orchards. The maintenance of a reasonable degree of flexibility of land use within broad guidelines or parameters is essential, otherwise unnecessary economic hardship may result. Also recognition needs to be given to other potential agricultural uses of particular areas of land other than the current use, e.g. much of the land in the Lower South East is just as suited to horticultural production as it is to grazing which is the current land use in many circumstances. Similarly, in parts of the Adelaide Hills.
- . To be able to expand farm size without having to pay land prices that bear no relation to the agricultural productive value of the locality. This is particularly a problem in the rural fringe areas of Adelaide, and other large towns and cities. Often high land prices restrict or prevent the purchase of extra land necessary to improve or maintain a farmer's economic viability. However, South Australia has a shortage of good agricultural land and thus prices of such land are likely to remain at a premium over and above the price suggested by the productive capacity of the land.

- . To have a degree of confidence and security in the future of farming in a particular region to make continued investment decisions. Where other land uses may compete with farming and little or no planning recognition is given to farming, then the confidence of farmers to continue to invest in their business is unlikely to remain for long.
- . The necessity and opportunity for a farmer to build an extra house for a son on a newly granted title is a contentious issue. Many farmers claim the importance of having the son's dwelling on the property to ensure proper management of the farm. This would seem to be rather dubious and debatable. Under current legislation a farmer is allowed one extra title to enable a son to build a house, provided the land is held in a single Certificate of Title current on 1st December, 1972, the proposed allotment is not greater than one hectare and the remaining area constitutes an independent economic unit for primary production.

Several comments can be made on this issue. Overall there is a gradual decline in the number of farmers in South Australia and throughout Australia. Holdings per farmer are getting larger and capital is being substituted for labour through mechanisation. Currently many holdings have houses surplus to their requirements.

Throughout the State there are contrasting situations. In the wheat-sheep farming areas of the State, there is some trend towards farmers moving into local townships to live and to commute to the various holdings they own or lease in any direction from the town. This is probably occurring because of the extra costs (telephone, power, closeness to schools and shopping centres, isolation etc.) associated with living significant distances from country towns. A recent Adelaide University Geography Department survey of the Keith-Bordertown area has highlighted such trends.

In the areas close to the Adelaide fringes (e.g. Adelaide Hills, Northern Adelaide Plains) there is a definite demand to build extra dwellings on properties. This could be seen as a speculative exercise by some farmers. While farmers a long way from Adelaide may not recoup the cost of building a dwelling in a property sale, this is unlikely to be the case in the Adelaide Hills where a strong market exists for rural living. In the Adelaide Hills it is likely that residence on the farm aids its proper and economic management - seldom, however, will such residence be essential for its proper and economic management. With dairying and horticultural properties there is little doubt that residing on the property has many management advantages in terms of factors such as watering, packing, milking and home life. These factors will be most important on marginal holdings where the income from a property is unlikely to support two families.

6. PROTECTION OF RURAL LANDS FROM PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

Two types of rural landscape are likely to be of major interest to planners because of the high amenity currently placed on them by the community. Firstly, areas of residual bushland are becoming increasingly important - many consider vegetation in South Australia is already over-cleared and bans should be applied henceforth on further clearing of bushland. Secondly, high amenity is given to areas of highly developed agricultural land. These areas in the past may have carried spectacular bushland, but because of the prime agricultural value of the land it is likely to have been cleared and developed many years ago. The protection of prime agricultural land is now largely from urban encroachment.

The community having recognised a need to retain high amenity areas, e.g. natural bushland or prime agricultural land must further recognise that costs are involved in achieving such benefits. Further, the community must be made to realise that the costs involved should be borne by the community at large and not by any minority group - particularly not by established agricultural producers or long term rural dwellers.

6.1 Residual Bushland

Residual bushland will seldom now be on prime agricultural land. Further, even though a farmer may recognise the amenity of natural bushland, he may still be forced to clear it to increase his production area because of the high cost of cleared land nearby or the lack of any suitable land nearby to purchase or because of social or family restraints, e.g. does not want to shift from the area.

The issues involved in protecting natural bushland in South Australia have been considered in the "Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Vegetation Clearance" (Chairman C.R. Harris). The most relevant conclusions of this Committee are :-

- . Because of the increasing importance of the declining areas of uncleared land (subject to a variety of competing land use claims) the Committee considers it most important that vegetation clearance in the future should require more justification than is now required by statute. In the longer term this is envisaged by means of a "land use authority" supported by legislation.
- . Conservation of vegetation on private land is seen as an essential complement to the parks and reserves administered by Government. Financial and non-financial incentives were examined as possible ways of contributing to such conservation.
- . The importance of protecting roadside vegetation was acknowledged.
- . Management assistance should be available to ensure the long term maintenance, and the possible regeneration of natural bushland.

We endorse these general conclusions of the Committee but emphasise that the success of such proposals is dependent on an effective means of ensuring that the costs of retaining such natural bushland are borne more equitably by the community at large than under the present system. Until management incentives (e.g. rate reductions, subsidised fencing, vermin and weed control or the possible use of transferable development rights) are introduced as an effective means to retain natural bushland, then implementation of such policies will continue as a non-event.

We agree with comments by the Primary Producers Committee that the proposed "land use authority" should be attached to an existing authority, e.g. Department of Environment or possibly Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, rather than establishing a separate bureaucracy.

6.2 Prime Agricultural Land

With respect to prime agricultural land there are definitional problems. Firstly, there may be considerable variation in the definition of prime and indeed "prime" may change with time, e.g. due to changed water availability or to changed technology. "Amenity" of prime agricultural land may also change over time. Thus in 20 years' time the community's perception of the amenity of orchards, vineyards and vegetable gardens may have been lowered greatly, and the amenity from small farmlets and rural retreats have increased enormously.

If economic and agricultural criteria are not used as a basis to identify and preserve agricultural lands, a case may also be made on the grounds of landscape significance, amenity and green space near cities, e.g. the Adelaide Hills and the Southern Vales vineyard and almond growing area south of Adelaide. It is considered by many people that the rural landscape in such localities is enjoyable and pleasant because of the combination of wide ranging farming activities that are carried out in between uncleared bush landscapes.

Another facet of the amenity of these lands is their tourism value - this obviously has a significant economic value. As an example, the S.A. Government Tourist Bureau estimates that in 1974, over 2 million people visited wineries in the Barossa Valley, the Southern Vales and the Adelaide area.

6.3 Multiple Use Land

Between the two extremes of prime agricultural land and residual bushland (each with high amenity for preservation) are those areas which have multiple land uses, and for which pressures for change are greatest. Typically, these areas will have been cleared and used for agriculture at some time in the past. Now, however, they have been purchased for non-agricultural use or else they have no great comparative advantage for any particular form of agricultural production. These areas are the difficult ones as far as planning and policy are concerned. These are the areas in which the greatest restrictions/expansion of near urban living may be encouraged and these are the areas which must take the brunt of any restrictions enforced on the prime agricultural and natural vegetation areas. Thus, it is the success of defining how development should proceed in these multiple use areas that holds the key to planning of near-urban areas in South Australia.

A key to any planning should be that no established agricultural producers should be forced out of business more quickly as a result of not being in a prime agricultural area (exceptions must exist to allow Government acquisition for town sites etc.) Thus agricultural producers should have rate (Local Government and E. & W.S.), land tax etc., incentives retained/implemented for as long as they wish to remain in agricultural production in a multiple land use area.

If near-urban areas are to be subject to more stringent planning, then the most significant decisions to be made by planners will relate to the number of building permits to be allowed. The alternatives appear to be :-

- (1) Retain the status quo - allow rural adjustment to occur under normal market forces. Thus, one building per allotment or title will be possible with other provisions as per the Planning and Development Act.
- (2) Encourage further building/development, i.e. allocate planned hobby farming or rural living areas.
- (3) Preclude any further development, i.e. no clearing of natural vegetation without consent, no further building after a certain date, no subdivision or resubdivision.

Only measure (1) is likely to be non-contentious. If either measures (2) or (3) or any portion of them were implemented, then it is most important that the implications of such decisions are fully realised, e.g. effect on weeds, bushfires, fauna and on alternative production or recreation land elsewhere. From the traditional agricultural production/producer point of view and the possible management problems resulting from any major shifts in land ownership and production, it is essential that SADAF be involved at the planning stage and be readily accessible for consultation at the implementation stage.

7. EFFECTIVENESS OF CURRENT LAND USE AND LAND SUBDIVISION CONTROLS

7.1 Current Situation

Subdivision of rural land in South Australia is controlled under the Planning and Development Act. The planning objectives for rural lands as expressed in the Mount Lofty Ranges Study and Supplementary Development Plan, and similarly stated or inferred in other development plans for rural areas relate to -

- . landscape protection - "The rural character, scenic amenity and bushland of the Ranges should be conserved."
- . subdivision of rural land - "The subdivision of rural land should only be permitted if it can be shown that the resulting allotments are large enough to form an economic unit for the business of primary production."
- . agriculture - "As much rural land as possible should be retained in primary production."

The implementation and achievement of these objectives has been attempted through land use and land subdivision controls exercised under the Planning and Development Act. These relate to -

- . specific regulations for land-use zoning and other matters under Section 36 of the Act.
- . interim development control under Section 41.
- . subdivisional control under Part 12.
- . administrative action by appropriate authorities.
- . by the operation of other Acts which have land use and management implications.

Such controls must fit in with Development Plans for specific planning areas. Some controls are more suited to particular situations than others. In considering planning controls over the development of rural lands, two contrasting situations need to be recognised in South Australia, viz.

* Those lands adjacent to fringe areas of Adelaide and country cities and major towns and which have a number of competing and alternative uses. e.g. Adelaide Hills, Barossa Valley, Willunga Basin and Northern Adelaide Plains. These situations are complex and dynamic because :-

- . they contain a wide range of land uses and activities continually changing in scale and function.
- . they have a number of pressures acting on them which could lead to desirable or undesirable change.
- . the planners knowledge and understanding of how to plan, control and manage them is very imperfect. Planning of rural areas is still in its infancy and new techniques are continually evolving.

* Those lands more distant from Adelaide and other cities and major towns and which have a relatively stable (traditional agricultural) land use pattern. e.g. Mid North, Yorke and Eyre Peninsula and the Murray Mallee.

Types of control used in rural areas of South Australia at present include :

7.1.1 Regulatory Approach

The regulatory approach as currently operated by land use zoning is more suited to localities or regions where land use is relatively unchanging or static. Zoning is not suited to complex and dynamic areas such as the Adelaide Hills. Positive direction rather than negative control would appear to be more suitable. How such direction can be achieved would appear a major problem in the development of rural planning.

7.1.2 Subdivision Control On Freehold Land

The Planning and Development Act was amended in 1972 to require the approval of the Director of Planning and the local council for creation of any new allotment of 30 hectares or less.

When the amending legislation was introduced, concern was expressed at the manner in which large areas of the rural countryside were being subdivided and used for urban type development. This development was considered to pose a threat to efficient primary production and was quickly destroying the rural character of particular areas.

The amended legislation was considered by the Director of Planning to be fair and reasonable and in the best interests of all rural landholders who are genuinely anxious to maintain primary production on a sound basis. The three key aspects were:-

- . Owners of any allotment will be permitted to divide that allotment provided that the applicant can prove to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning that each allotment proposed to be created will comprise and be used for, an independent economic unit for the business of primary production.
- . To enable a farmer who wishes to allow, for example, his son or relative to erect a house on his land and secure a separate title for that house, the Director will approve of the plan for resubdivision, providing the proposed allotment is not greater than 1 hectare and the land is held in a single Certificate of Title current on the 1st December, 1972, and provided the remaining area of land in the original Certificate of Title can be proved to be an economic unit for the business of primary production.
- . The Director will approve the creation of an allotment, no greater than 1 hectare, where the owner of any allotment wishes to obtain separate titles for houses existing or under construction prior to the 1st December, 1972.

Additional restraints are imposed within water catchment areas to prevent pollution of public water supplies. These restraints on land sub-division have been established by the Engineering and Water Supply Department but are enforced by the Director of Planning. Generally the creation of allotments with areas of less than 8 hectares is not permitted.

Subdivision of rural land in most Planning Areas is based on a Government policy aimed at preserving "economic farming units". This concept does not apply, however, in the Metropolitan Planning Area, where, following the authorization of the Supplementary Development Plans for Willunga District Council area on 12th July, 1973, and for the Mounty Lofty Ranges on 27th February, 1976, the following provisions apply to rural areas outside townships.

- . Plains north and south of Adelaide - minimum size allotments = 4 hectares except in Willunga District Council area where the need to preserve the rural land is emphasized.
- . Mounty Lofty Ranges - economic farming units.
- . Hills Face Zone - no more allotments can be created.
- . No controls can be exercised over allotments greater than 30 hectares in size.

As a result of pressures for subdivision prior to and resulting from these controls, there has been the creation of large numbers of predominantly residential allotments on land which is particularly suitable for horticultural and viticultural purposes.

7.1.3 Conditions on Leasehold Land

Private development may be carried out on either freehold or leasehold land. With leasehold land there are additional restrictions relating to the conditions of the lease and direct control can be invoked by the annual lease payments and/or conditions on leases. In recent years restrictions have been imposed on land use on leasehold land e.g. in Adelaide Hills. For example, a condition of sale is that if land use is changed from traditional agricultural (e.g. dairying and potato growing) to grazing with non-traditional animals (e.g. horses, or other hobby farm usage such as coloured wool production) - then annual rentals will be in line with the new highest and best use. In recent years there have been many instances of rentals being increased several fold.

While this may tend to retain traditional agricultural pursuits in given areas (with supposedly increased amenity) it is likely to create serious anomalies and inequities. For example it will "lock in" producers in an industry e.g. dairying or potato growing where the rational option is to sell out and allow adjustment of the industry to occur in response to normal market forces.

On the other hand. it may be argued that current rentals are low and in effect are a form of concessional rent which the farmer expects to be reflected in the market value of his property i.e. very similar to the value of freehold land. Are these valid restrictions on leasehold land in near-urban rural areas? Are they inequitable costs borne by the landowner instead of by the public at large? i.e. the retention of supposed greater amenity. On what basis were the original allocations of freehold and leasehold lands made? Is there any point in placing restrictions on leasehold lands interspersed with freehold lands on which different restrictions are placed?

Can the pattern of development be allowed on a freehold vs. leasehold basis? This seems most unlikely as this was not the original intention of leasehold vs. freehold land. The placement of restrictions on leasehold land in areas with considerable freehold areas of similar

characteristics appears little more than a stop gap measure of controlling land development. It only results in considerable individual inequities and can in no way be compared with good land use planning. There needs to be a detailed examination of the inequities and conflicts produced by the Crown Lands Act and the Planning and Development Act particularly in relation to near-urban rural areas.

7.1.4 Implementation Problems

In relation to Development Plans and their implementation at the district and local level, several major deficiencies exist.

At present after comprehensive survey and analysis of a region a planning area plan is prepared and authorised under Section 29/33 of the Planning and Development Act. Following this, a very large step is taken straight into implementing the plan through the various methods available (Section 36). What this means in practice is that in most instances very broad and general policies are implemented in fine detail by zoning and other regulations without progressively refining these policies through various appropriate district, local and functional levels beforehand. As a consequence, it is often difficult for laymen and professionals alike to perceive the relationships between policies and regulations. This problem is further compounded because on the one hand, development plans are written in an easily read style with colourful and simple graphics while regulations are prepared in esoteric legal language with tightly drawn zoning maps on a cadastral base.

A number of problems can be highlighted with the current sub-division control regulations as they affect rural land, viz :

* Minimum allotment size

The use of a minimum lot size of 30 hectares has resulted in much farming land being divided up into allotments of this particular size. Such an allotment size is a waste of land resources as it is generally too large for the buyer's requirements in the case of rural retreats or too small for economic primary production unless some form of horticulture is intended. Both here and in other States (e.g. N.S.W.) it has been demonstrated that controls on minimum allotment size tend to accelerate rather than retard the diversion of land from primary production to other uses, i.e. such legislation is generally inefficient and counter productive in what it was set out to achieve. Whatever is the minimum allotment size for the subdivision of rural land within reasonable proximity to an urban populis tends to become the "desirable" size for a rural retreat.

Also any controls on minimum allotment size probably bear little relationship to the existing pattern of subdivision and could therefore divert attention from other more appropriate forms of development control.

- . By using minimum allotment sizes, this means that there is no control over the land use carried out on allotments of this size and greater.
- . Currently subdivision tends to be considered before land use. Sub-division should only apply after the generally desired future use and character has been decided on.

* Independent economic unit

- The use of the concept of "independent economic unit" (as defined in Section 70A) as a basis for rural subdivisions under 30 ha is an unsatisfactory one in practice. This is fraught with problems because :-
- of the varying financial requirements and life style of prospective purchasers. For example a purchaser may only wish to obtain 50% or less of his income from agricultural pursuits.
 - in defining a minimum economic unit, average values for particular variables are used in calculations. These may not be at the necessary levels for efficient operation of the farm business.
 - what is a minimum economic unit for a particular land use may be too small in five years' time due to market fluctuations, rising production costs and changing technology.
 - variations in the management skill of the landholder himself may alone result in enormous variations in the size of the minimum economic unit for a particular land use.
 - many prospective purchasers of rural land near Adelaide opt for horticultural uses in their proposed applications because the high return per hectare means that they need only have a smaller allotment than otherwise for it to be considered an economic unit (even though they may have no intentions of carrying out the proposed land use). As well it means that the vendor can subdivide more allotments from a given parcel of land.
 - no enforced relationships of actual land use to proposed land use.
- Recent history of War Service Land Settlements indicates the problems with using particular allotment sizes. In rural planning, especially in those complex and dynamic areas near the urban fringe, it is important that the lessons of the past are learnt and such problems are not perpetuated in the future.
- More consideration needs to be given to the exercising of controls direct on building development (rather than via sub-division limits) after the desired future character of particular localities, districts and regions has been decided on. Current pressures on allotment size generates purely from the inherent implied rights to build a dwelling on each allotment.

* Zoning in rural planning

The major difficulty of implementing planning policies revolves around the defining of zones (they may be called regions, planning districts or areas or policy areas) and ensuring that serious inequities do not occur as a result of the creation of such zones.

The degree of zoning proposed for rural areas may vary from very complex and detailed - for example as suggested in the State

Planning Authority "Model Planning REgulations - Country Planning Areas" to a more general restricted zoning plan with more emphasis on "consent use" as suggested in "Adelaide Hills Study - A.W. Hutchings".

Zoning presents a general series of problems and disadvantages (many of these were highlighted in the Final Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Land Tenure.

- . Zoning is negative or permissive rather than positive or compulsive. It can prevent particular forms of undesirable use, but it cannot ensure land is developed and used in some particular manner perceived to be in the public interest. (No achievement of desired future character through zoning).
- . Zones are determined only after a lengthy period of consideration, exhibition of planning schemes and the hearing of objections. As a result, the zoning is frequently out of date by the time the plan comes into effect so that some extraordinary step, normally Ministerial intervention is required.
- . Zoning is not well understood by the public. It is commonplace in planning appeals for even intelligent, well-informed objectors to admit that they had known of the existence of a planning scheme and of its general provisions for their area at the time when objections were being received but that they did not object.
- . Zoning not to build houses does not compensate an owner of an allotment for the right to build a house unless it is associated with concepts such as transferable development rights.
- . The names of particular zones, their purpose and permitted uses may be contradictory e.g. rural living, country living and general farming zones - this comment applies specifically to SPA - Country Planning Regulations.
- . Subdivision controls in particular zones are still being based on :
 - (1) arbitrary sized minimum allotments - on what basis are these decided?
 - (2) Any smaller allotments below this minimum are being used on the concept of "independent economic unit".
- . Country zoning regions do not appear to cater for complex areas where various policy areas may exist e.g. Basket Range.
- . Is very complex and legalistic.

However any form of control of private development must involve some form of boundaries and hence zoning (unless a system of consent use without any guidelines is in operation - this is not a reasonable possibility). Thus some decisions must be made to define zones, and these will continue to remain a complex and debatable decision. Mechanisms must be sought to remedy any inequities that will result from determination of zone boundaries - transferable development rights should be further investigated as a means of minimizing such inequities.

7.2 Suggested Changes

It is considered that to bring about the more effective implementation of stated planning objectives that :-

- The planning steps should be taken from the broad (in the case of a region) to the particular (discreet localities, sub-districts or planning areas), and they should be made obvious in planning documents for the public to see and understand. A logical progression would be the survey of regions and districts, the analysis of the information, the development of policies, and the drawing up of action plans to bring about the achievement of such policies.
- Continual on-going public consultation needs to be developed to ensure their understanding of the issues and reasons and rationale behind particular decisions and ultimately to ensure wider acceptance of planning policies. Particular strategies and techniques for more effective public consultation and involvement may need to be developed. (See Section 9 for more details).
- Presentation of planning documents should be in a form that enhances the communication of the information being presented. Greater use should be made of visual forms of communication to compliment written information. More innovative approaches to communicating complex ideas need to be developed. There needs to be a greater orientation towards the "client" public. The written word should be clear and easy to read. (See Section 8 for more details).
- Planning approaches which are positive and management orientated should be preferred to those which are negative and control orientated.

7.2.1 Rural Planning in Complex and Dynamic Areas

Complex and dynamic areas are suggested to be those within 160 km of Adelaide, near regional cities or near large country towns. A possible sequential procedure to bring about the achievement of stated Regional Objectives is as follows :-

A particular planning area needs to be divided up into Planning Districts based on natural geographic boundaries. To ensure the sound implementation of regional objectives at the district level, there needs to be the assembly of adequate data (physical, economic and social) for analysis to enable the development of sound, rational and logical policies. An existing land use map for each district needs to be drawn up. This should include information on existing subdivisions and future land market demands where possible. A land use suitability or capability map also needs to be drawn up. This would be based on land use surveys that may or may not have already been carried out. If insufficient information is available, more survey work may be required, e.g. a large portion of the Mount Lofty Ranges is lacking detailed land use capability maps.

A Structure Plan could then be developed based on an analysis of this data. This plan would bring together and highlight the policies and preferred options argued out and recommended in writing. A visual plan should be included to enhance the communication of planning policies and factors contributing to the desired future character of the area.

Then particular discrete "subdistricts", "zones" or "policy areas" could be identified and delineated on a district plan. Such "policy areas" could be defined areas of the various types of current land use

e.g. horticulture, pine forest, bushland, conservation areas, recreational areas, land suitable for development from a present extensive agricultural use to an intensive horticultural use or the environs of a river through the district.

Desired future character statements and plans need to be developed for each policy area in each district.

Then action plans and proposals will need to be defined and developed to bring about the achievement of a desired future character of the particular policy area, e.g. reforestation of eroded slopes, further subdivision of particular lands designated for rural living, amalgamation and consolidation of allotments in a horticultural area, or the establishment of a walking trail in a recreation area. Action plans and proposals would provide a sound guide for local government authorities to assess development applications and implement activities programmes.

Use should be made of guideline documents for specific activities or uses. Such guidelines relate to a specific activity and the criteria and performance required for location and siting approvals. Their aim is to be constructive in assisting applicants understand the relevant policies and requirements, e.g. piggeries.

Because of the complexity of such planning regions or areas close to Adelaide and the fragility of particular "policy areas", particular development proposals will be deemed either a "consent use" or "not permitted". This would in fact be a continuation of Interim Development Control that is in force throughout most Adelaide Hills district council areas. As all changes are considered on a consent basis, relatively strict control will exist.

Throughout all the above procedures, the detail required at each step will vary from planning area to planning area and from district to district. The availability of sufficient funds to employ the necessary professionals to fully implement the approach could be a limiting factor.

An alternative low key - low cost approach would be to allow local government to implement plans within its resources to achieve overall policy objectives. With such a situation some "watchdog" powers should be retained by the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs.

* Specific Implementation Tools

If rational planning is to be achieved in complex and dynamic areas, such as the Adelaide Hills and the Southern Vales that have already been intensively subdivided, then attention needs to be focused directly on controls on building development. This is particularly so in the Adelaide Hills where a large pool of residual development rights exists because of the large number of undeveloped allotments throughout the area. Controls over building rights will be essential to achieve the desired future character in particular "policy areas".

A number of implementation tools can be used with varying degrees of effectiveness. These are described below. Successful implementation of objectives and policies is unlikely to be in a single approach; rather a number of alternative approaches which complement one another are likely to be needed to meet the necessary flexibility required in complex and dynamic areas.

. Transferable development rights

The legal concept underlying transferable development rights

(TDR) is that title to real estate is not a unitary or monolithic right, but rather may be compared to a "bundle of individual rights" each one of which may be separated from the rest and transferred to someone else, leaving the original owner with all other rights of ownership. This is not a new or novel idea. We have long been accustomed to the separate and alienability of such components of title as mineral rights, and mortgage liens, among others. One of the components of this "bundle of individual rights" is the right to develop land.

The concept is becoming increasingly used in the USA, generally to preserve historic landmarks but also to conserve farmland and open space. What it means in effect, is that landowners within areas to be conserved for reasons of landscape protection, etc. (as identified in planning policy documents) will continue to own their land but may sell their rights of further building development to others or builders who wish to develop areas delineated on plans for development. It would appear to be a particularly suitable technique for rural districts containing subdivided land why may, if developed for housing, render portions of the district unsuitable for agriculture and/or the maintenance of an open character.

TDR's would appear to offer a number of benefits over the current control system, viz.:

- They would enable some modification of the development potential inherent in the present subdivision pattern where this is necessary to achieve planning objectives without the need to consider arbitrary bans on development or the payment of large amounts of compensation by governments.
- Speculation on land without development rights would be reduced. Additionally the rate of inflation of rural land values should be greatly reduced once development rights are separated from ownership or use rights. Two components of inflation will be involved:
 - . inflation in value for use in agricultural production - reflected in land value. This should make it easier for primary producers to acquire additional land if this is necessary to ensure their continued economic viability. Land values may more closely reflect the agricultural productive value than they do at present.
 - . inflation in value from the development right - reflected in the value of the transferable development right.
- Land owners who have development rights removed will receive compensation through being able to sell their development rights on the open market to other land owners in for example a policy area, earmarked for rural living. The

owners in these areas would need to buy a development right before any building development could proceed.

If TDR's were to be implemented the administrative arrangements would need to be clarified in considerable detail. Problems will arise in defining areas to which TDR's will apply and the likely effect on adjoining areas. Establishing an effective market for TDR will be a most important Government activity for the overall success of such a scheme. The possibility of selective rating (council, E.W.S. and land tax) of the ownership or use right and the development right components of TDR present a further means of obtaining policy objectives.

A comprehensive educational programme on the workings of any scheme involving TDR would need to be implemented to reduce public confusion.

. Single tenement policy

Many primary production properties in the Adelaide Hills consist of a number of small allotments that are adjacent to one another and have been owned and managed as one for many decades (often since the turn of this century). To bring the achievement of particular "policy area" proposals, it would seem reasonable to restrict the number of dwelling houses to the existing number or if no houses currently exist, then only one dwelling be allowed to be built on the whole of the property. Such a policy, when combined with TDR would remove the development rights from all allotments except one from a particular date unless a building permit had already been issued.

. Consolidation and re-arrangement

If TDR's and a single tenement policy were not adopted, consideration should be given to fostering the consolidation and re-arrangement of the many existing allotments on farm lands into a compact residential settlement leaving the remainder of the farm holding in a single title and protected from further subdivision. This way the number of allotments on the holding would remain the same, but instead of say five allotments of 10-15 ha, there could be four allotments of 2 ha located together in a compact residential cluster leaving the remaining 40-70 ha of land in one title for continued use for farming. Farmers would not be allowed to resubdivide this residual area in the future.

This way of "trade off" would exist. A farmer would be allowed to sell off a small area of his property with its inherent development rights for four rural living allotments, while the residual area would be permanently protected from any further subdivision, so preserving the land for agricultural use.

Cluster housing

The development of "cluster housing on farms" could enable the retention of an open landscape, the proper management of land while giving people an opportunity to live in the country.

The cluster housing farm would be similar to a group of home units or town houses in a town. It could be established under an extension of existing Strata Title legislation. This approach would be suitable for large holdings of 100-200 ha. It would also be an approach for encouraging the amalgamation of many small holdings into larger units under uniform management.

With the co-operation of planning authorities it would be possible for perhaps five to ten houses to be built in a cluster fairly close to an access road and other services. Each house would be on an allotment of about one hectare, carefully sited with consideration to bushfire hazards, effluent disposal and views of the open landscape. The houses would share water and sewerage systems, and an electricity transformer. If mains electricity and telephones were required, the cost to the house owner would be significantly reduced. Each owner would have an individual title to their one hectare while at the same time being a shareholder with rights and responsibilities in the corporation which owned the remainder as common land.

If they wished, the owners of the individual houses could collectively employ one of themselves as manager, or else employ an outside manager to ensure that the land was properly managed, and preserved. In this way gainfull employment would be available to farmers' sons who presently cannot be accommodated on the family farm and drift to the city. As well the efficient small landholder could spread his expertise over a larger property for much less capital outlay than is now the case.

From the point of view of local government bodies, such a form of rural subdivision would better facilitate the enforcement of improved land management. Instead of having to contact up to ten part-time farmers to control pests, diseases, weeds and vermin, they would have only one corporation to deal with.

Under such a scheme, the future of a property would be less subject to the vagaries of the human life cycle. Aging owners might sell their strata title houses to younger people and move elsewhere. The social basis for such a project would need to be closely examined.

Agreements

Other countries, including the United Kingdom, have had for many years, powers within legislation for planning authorities to enter into agreements with any person holding an interest in land for the purpose of implementing policies and proposals. This approach has been successful and is particularly useful for rural areas. Examples include agreements related to Landscape Appearance, Woodland Dedication, Nature Reserves, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Regulating the Development or Use of Land, Field Monuments, Land near Highways and Access.

Such agreements have a number of advantages. Policy can be implemented without public acquisition. They implement by management rather than control and because they are entered into voluntarily by the landholder are of obvious mutual benefit to all concerned. The Planning and Development Act should be amended to enable such agreements to be entered into between governments and landholders.

Recommendations

The Piccadilly Valley and the Willunga districts are key areas of the complex and dynamic Adelaide Hills and Southern Vales districts respectively. In such key areas TDR's together with a single tenement policy and agreements would appear to be the more effective and desirable policy. The other implementation tool options may be less satisfactory in key policy areas because of the increased numbers of dwellings that would result. However, controls on the location of dwellings would make these proposals eminently better than the current situation.

If development rights are separated from land use and ownership rights, then subdivision controls in terms of minimum allotment sizes will become largely irrelevant in complex and dynamic rural areas such as the Adelaide Hills. This is because subdivision controls are currently being used to control development. Similarly the concept of "independent economic units" as currently used for subdivisions under 30 ha will also be irrelevant.

With land not possessing a development right, some criteria may need to be developed to decide on what basis, if any, further subdivision of land will be allowed.

7.2.2 Rural Planning in Distant Areas

Distant rural areas i.e. in excess of 160 km of Adelaide or distant from regional cities or major country towns are of low priority for planning because of minimal competition for land use i.e. a relatively stable land use pattern. Although agriculture is likely to remain the dominant land use, the possible alternative planning and development systems for such regions should be recognised. In particular consideration should be given to the possible effects of planning decisions in the complex multiple use areas which may have some effect on the distant rural areas. The alternatives for implementing policy objectives are:

Minimal planning and control - under such a system market and technological forces would determine development in rural areas. Cropping areas and livestock numbers would be determined by market forces (including seasonal limitations). Similarly the rise and decline of rural towns within these areas would be dependent on market forces viz. economic, technological and climatic. Subdivision would be controlled by market demand - whether for farming land or for allotments in or near rural towns.

Control of development based on land use potential

This form of control would suggest use of management criteria to achieve objectives defined by land use capability surveys. A problem of such control would be the difficulty of ensuring that farming in marginal areas could readily expand and contract in response to market forces. Definition of marginal farming areas has always proved difficult, and this problem appears likely to remain. The possible exception is the definition of land which is marginal because of erosion susceptibility - even this may change in the longer term as a result of technological advance.

Control of development would particularly involve township development. Provision of goods and services by government can readily affect township development. The decline of other towns will result and it is likely to be far more difficult to regulate the decline of such towns.

The Northern Flinders Ranges are a distant rural area in need of special protection. This region is of relatively low agricultural productivity potential. However it has high amenity/tourism value, but because it is a semi-arid environment it is subject to erosion/litter problems. Rural planning in this instance must have long term amenity/tourism objectives with agricultural production relegated to a by product of tourism status.

Limited Control of Rural Development

Control of natural vegetation clearance is one area in which government control may be desirable. Land clearing is particularly vulnerable to market and political forces. The clearing process is irreversible and hence it may be desirable to exert some control to insulate the clearing process from direct market forces.

Control of natural vegetation clearance is probably the most useful and the least cost planning activity for distant rural areas. Methods of implementing such a system must be examined - most likely to be accommodated within the Soil Conservation Act and/or the Marginal Lands Act.

Attraction to Urban People

Distant rural areas in South Australia have little attraction for urban people. Occasional interest has been created

in conserving large areas of natural scrub e.g. the north eastern portion of the Ninety Mile Desert in the South East, or areas on Eyre Peninsula. These areas however are remnant poor or marginal soil areas past over in earlier waves of land development.

The other planning interest in distant rural areas may relate to shack and other development in coastal areas and along river systems and to the Northern Flinders Ranges as mentioned above. Seldom however will such development be in competition with land to be used for agricultural production. If problems occur for example with shack or other forms of resort development then Local Government should be able to extend guidelines used to control development in complex areas of the state.

Subdivision of Agricultural Holdings

The creation of new land titles is likely to continue as a contentious issue even in distant agricultural areas. The problems of minimum allotment sizes and minimum economic units suggest these are inappropriate criteria for determining subdivisions. Flexible sub-division policies are desirable to enable adjustment e.g. property amalgamation, consolidations etc. While it is recognised that pressures will exist for land subdivision following a series of good seasons and/or prices there seem to be few reliable guidelines for allowing subdivision. The examination of individual applications by both local government and the State Planning Authority* should provide adequate safeguards.

* The State Planning Authority is now under control of the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs.

8. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNICATION OF PLANNING POLICIES TO THE COMMUNITY, ESPECIALLY THE RURAL COMMUNITY

The rural community's understanding of planning policies is generally poor. This stems from a number of factors, namely:-

- . Inadequate public involvement and participation in the planning process (see 9).
- . A general mistrust of government organisations that make important decisions affecting the planning of particular regions and yet these organisations are not represented locally at the regional level. As a result misunderstandings occur and the credibility of the organisation suffers. In short, the organisations policies are not effectively understood.
- . Planning documents are not presented in a form that fosters a clear communication of concepts, ideas and policies to the lay public. Many aspects of planning are quite complex and if the public is to clearly understand what is involved, more innovative techniques need to be used to ensure more effective communication.

Overall these three points highlight the lack of an effective communication strategy. There needs to be a greater "client orientation". Skilled professionals should be used to ensure that efforts to effectively inform the public are based on a sound strategy, not one which is piece-meal or ad hoc.

Planning documents should use simpler language that enables a clearer understanding of the message the planner is trying to communicate. Greater use should be made of graphics and other techniques that will foster better communication.

Finally, the Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs should be regionalised to make their officers more accessible to the rural public. Both parties will better understand one another and as a result the credibility and effectiveness of communication is likely to improve immensely.

9. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN PLANNING

The planning of the Adelaide Hills and other near urban-traditional rural areas has occurred to date with only passive involvement of the traditional dwellers. However, with proposals for increasing control over development in such areas, it is important that efforts should be made to increasingly involve traditional rural dwellers in the planning process.

Increased public participation in the planning process should lead to an increased awareness and understanding of planning issues and proposals. It is an educational process. As well it should assist in the implementation of planning policies and objectives at the regional and district level. This stems from the fact that if the public has been involved in the planning process since its inception in a particular area, then it is likely that policies and proposals will have a greater chance of successful implementation than if there is no public involvement.

The deliberate involvement of the public in planning is likely to be time-consuming, demanding and at times frustrating. However, if carried out properly under the guidance of skilled professionals, its benefits are likely to exceed the costs involved. As well it is likely to increasingly meet the needs of a public that demands a greater say in the contentious area of planning rather than leave it all to the bureaucrats.

9.1 Representative Community Opinion

Planners need to make more positive attempts to involve the public at all levels. Currently their efforts are too passive - they in the main rely upon the public to initiate a response to the launching of a new development plan. Of late the planners have made several improvements in their attempts to get an increased involvement by rural people into the planning process. These have included the setting up of the Primary Producers Committee (an advisory committee to the State Planning Authority) and conducting public meetings in country areas to explain new plans and answer any questions. While these efforts are laudable, much more needs to be done to get a more representative involvement of rural people in planning, especially the less vocal majority.

The rural dweller sees planning policies being generated by a vocal influential few who have little feeling for or interest in the traditional rural dweller. For many of these rural people the increasing government bureaucracy (Local Government, State Planning Authority, Department of Environment and Conservation, Department of Housing, Urban and Regional Affairs), presents a formidable array of mystery, concern and distrust as well as being a waste of tax payers' monies.

In developing procedures and strategies for public participation, use should be made of skilled sociologists. There needs to be a concerted effort to seek out the opinions of landholders through social surveys (personal interview) to seek a more balanced over-view of opinions (representative opinions) of the whole community. Such surveys have been carried out in overseas countries - particularly the U.S.A. e.g. Jackson et al in Arkansas.

The current procedure of public involvement (participation tends to favour the more vocal and often better educated members and organisations in the community) resulting in an imbalance of opinion. Careful consideration needs to be given to more innovative procedures to achieve greater balance than the current process of public display of development plans and the occasional holding of public meetings. Specific strategies that will lead to greater social involvement and participation need to be developed. These could include social surveys, discussion groups and working parties. Surveys, apart from gathering information on opinions, attitudes and understanding of landholders of planning issues and proposals, can also foster interest and awareness in those where this hitherto did not exist. Another approach could be along the lines used by the Department of Transport in involving the community in the North East Transport Study in Adelaide.

9.2 Other Issues

. Urban-Rural discussion

Rural people should be given every opportunity to articulate their views and concerns to all involved with the planning process and to all urban people. These should be positive gestures of Government. Further, at the interface discussion and understanding of points of view should be encouraged between urban and traditional rural dwellers. The role/importance/problems of rural dwellers should be continually placed before urban dwellers.

. Rural evolution

All rural and urban people must have the chance to understand the current direction and extent of evolution of agriculture and of society, including urban dwellers. The likely changes in land use and the pressures causing this should be emphasised and how these forces may result in the decline of towns in some areas and the expansion of towns in other areas. Traditionally the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries has been little involved with such education processes. However, this Department may best understand the processes involved and should in future play a more active role in informing the community at large of these changes.

. Value of land of high amenity

Owners of areas of high amenity, e.g. natural scrub or prime agricultural land must be made aware of the value that the community as a whole places on these areas. Owners should be informed of the possible alternative means of obtaining their objectives when they are considering development of high amenity area, e.g. clearing of natural scrub.

. Costs of rural policies

Anti-development policies imposed on rural areas should be for the benefit of the community as a whole. Urban

people must realize that the community as a whole must bear the costs of such policies. The community benefits must not be at the expense of the traditional rural dweller. Examples of arbitrary zoning, e.g. of the Hills Face Zone bear witness to the inequities of the benefits occurring to traditional landowners.

10. INVOLVEMENT OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

10.1 Should The South Australian Department of Agriculture and Fisheries Be Involved In Planning?

The most recent official policy statement of the South Australian Department of Agriculture and Fisheries' (SADAF) objectives is in the Callaghan Report ("A Review of the Department of Agriculture in the Light of Changed and Changing Needs"), 1973, viz.:-

"Objectives of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries should be in general to:-

'Foster the development, conservation and use of the State's soil, land, water and pastoral resources in the best interests of the community to meet present and future needs, and at all times oversight the economic welfare of the State's rural industries and its producers'."

It follows from this that SADAF has an important interest and involvement in the development of rural lands and factors affecting the economic viability of farmers. Planning decisions impinge on both of these aspects to varying degrees in particular situations. In view of the infancy of planning skills in rural areas (compared with urban areas) it is likely that SADAF will need to make major contributions. SADAF is the Government department with the most complete knowledge, understanding and competence in the management and use of rural lands. This along with its close working relationship with the farming community (with their particular and often unique problems) means that SADAF is ideally placed to make a significant contribution to the planning process.

10.2 The Existing And Past Involvement Of SADAF in Planning

Since early 1973 the main role of SADAF has been in advising the Director of Planning on applications for subdivision or resubdivision of rural land referred to it by the Director of Planning. An administrative instruction from the Director of Agriculture issued in August, 1973, covered the early arrangements, which essentially required this Department to report whether proposed allotments "will comprise, and be used for, an independent economic unit for the business of primary production".

From the outset difficulties arose in the interpretation of the legislation and the concept of independent economic units. The officers involved in reporting on proposed resubdivision of rural land, however, have kept in close contact with the State Planning Office and have maintained good working arrangements in spite of the difficulties. As an evolving process our involvement in planning has expanded and become more and more complex as time went by.

The existing and past involvement of the SADAF in respect of rural planning is summarised as follows:-

. Application for resubdivision

All applications referred by the State Planning Office have been assessed on the basis of the "independent economic unit". This has involved inspections by field staff, reports, and occasionally giving evidence at Planning Appeal Board hearings. There were 96 applications dealt with in 1976/77 and these were disposed as follows by extension officers from the various Departmental branches:-

Horticulture	50	Horticulture/Agronomy	3
Agronomy	5	Horticulture/Livestock	5
Livestock	15	Horticulture/Dairy	3
Dairy	8	Agronomy/Livestock	3
Animal Health	1	Livestock/Dairy	1
Unaccounted	2		

The number of resubdivisions dealt with has been increasing steadily since 1973, with the main pressures arising in the Adelaide Hills, Adelaide Plains, Southern Vales and the Barossa. Some have involved the Riverland and the South East.

The time involved in administrative processing, carrying out property inspections, and preparing reports for each application is conservatively estimated to be 6½ man hours. In 1976/77, this would have been about 700 man hours which represent 40% of one man year.

. The Report of the Committee on the Preservation of Land for Horticultural and Viticultural Use (Harris Report - May 1976)

SADAF has had considerable inputs into this report. The report has defined those areas of the State under pressures from urban development which should be preserved by planning measures for viticultural and horticultural use.

The conclusions and recommendations of the Committee, as outlined in Chapter 7, are that the land requirements for horticulture are sufficient to meet estimated demands to the year 2001, subject to certain qualifications. The report discusses the many complex problems associated with the pressures of urban and hobby farmer encroachment of agricultural land, and makes suggestions for minimising or overcoming these problems. The report has not been released as a public document.

. Rural-Urban Land Use Conflict in the Adelaide Hills

A discussion paper on problems and possible solutions, by Ian R. Lewis, extension horticulturist. As a public document, this has successfully prompted public participation and awareness of a very real problem of agriculture in the rural-urban fringe.

. Primary Producers Committee - SPO

The appointment of Mr. Ian R. Lewis to the Primary Producers Committee in 1977 has enabled this Department to keep in touch with the complex issues relating to planning as they affect the primary producers throughout the State. This is a useful contribution to the communication processes as they affect the producer, State Planning Office and the SADAF.

. The Adelaide Hills Study

With the appointment of the Monarto Development Commission to the Adelaide Hills Study, Mr. Ian R. Lewis, and officers of the Soils Branch have been involved in various discussions with officers of the Monarto Development Commission.

. Model Planning Regulations for Country Planning Areas

Draft Model Planning Regulations were examined by SADAF late in 1976, and suggestions made.

. Draft Development Plans

Draft Development Plans and Revised Development Plans for the Willunga area, Adelaide Hills and Riverland have included substantial inputs from SADAF from time to time. It has been pleasing to note that State Planning Office has implemented many of the suggestions from our officers, and particularly from those agricultural industry submissions which were canvassed by officers of the SADAF.

. Planning Appeal Board Cases

Departmental officers are increasingly being called upon as expert witnesses to appear on behalf of the Crown in cases involving the State Planning Authority and developers or private individuals.

More recently a Departmental officer was involved as an expert witness for the S.A. Land Commission in a Supreme Law Court case.

Much of this involvement has been of an open ended nature over several days and often at very short notice.

. Land Use Surveys

Officers of the Soils Branch have carried out land use capability surveys of the site of the proposed new city of Monarto for the Monarto Development Commission.

More recently a land use capability survey of the southern Mount Lofty Ranges is being carried out in conjunction with C.S.I.R.O.

The Mount Gambier office of the Department has recently assisted the Mount Gambier District Council in the preparation and determination of various zones. This assistance has been mainly in the provision of maps with information on soil types, land use and recommendations of those tracts of land which should be prevented from being subdivided for urban use.

Miscellaneous

SADAF officers have been members of various ad hoc working parties, and committees involved in aspects of rural planning e.g. the Committee on Vegetation Clearance in South Australia.

Comment:

Since 1973, there has been a progressively increased contribution and involvement by the SADAF in planning. During this time there has also been a greater liaison between State Planning Office and the SADAF staff and good working relationships have developed along with a better understanding of each others roles and activities.

With the State Planning Office making increased requests of SADAF officers (through increasing resubdivision applications, Planning Appeal Board cases, etc.) it would seem an appropriate time to review the SADAF current contribution and involvement, especially in view of the increasing demands and the changes of emphasis in its activities.

Concern is expressed over a number of aspects of the SADAF current involvement, namely:-

The continued use of the concept of "independent economic unit" as a basis for the control of subdivision of rural land into allotments of less than 30 ha. With an increasingly significant amount of time being spent on the inspection and reporting of resubdivision proposals, the effectiveness of this is seriously questioned on the grounds of:-

- The impossibility of assessing economic viability for the intended subdivision. There are so many variables in terms of management and markets to make the study on production potential of little value.
- The irrelevance of this whole procedure as there is no way of controlling the future land use of the intended subdivision (not that such control is desirable). There seems little point in carrying out an elaborate study to justify the subdivision of a property for intensive horticultural use when it is the clear purpose of the owner to use the land for grazing horses once he has carried out this theoretical exercise.

When this is considered in relation to earlier comments in this submission, it is felt that the time being spent on those inspections and reports would be far more usefully employed in other facets of planning or other Departmental activities.

The involvement of Departmental officers as expert witnesses in Planning Appeal Board cases where the Department has hitherto not been asked to report on the proposed subdivision.

10.3 Future Involvement Of SADAF In Planning

General guidelines which should determine the SADAF's contribution to the planning process are:-

- . An involvement in those areas where the planning impact on rural and agricultural lands and people is greatest. Such planning policy involvement would be greatest in areas which are complex and dynamic and where the land use conflicts are greatest, i.e. near urban areas.
- . An involvement in activities where the SADAF has particular skills and knowledge that are not readily available from elsewhere, e.g. country based extension officers with an intimate knowledge of the rural lands, people and industries in their district or region, soils research officers with skills in carrying out land use capability surveys. Such skills could be used to prepare agricultural activity guideline documents.
- . An involvement in activities which maximise the achievement of particular planning objectives for the least cost inputs (especially manpower). Individual property inspections would not be one of these activities. They are very expensive to carry out and the particular planning objectives have not been achieved to date e.g. minimum economic units.

These guidelines suggest there are four particular areas where the SADAF should make a significant contribution to the planning process.

(1) Determination of planning policies

- . To be involved on working parties, task forces etc. that may be set up to look into planning in particular rural areas. The definition of the objectives of rural planning in South Australia and the means of obtaining these objectives should be the major considerations of these high level decisionmakers. For example problems with the concept of "amenity" as an operational tool should be highlighted and alternative methodology sought.

(2) Evaluation of effects of various policy options

- . An evaluation of the effects of various planning proposals on rural people and the economics, management and production of food and fibre from their properties e.g.

SADAF could highlight the importance of costs of controls on private development being borne by the community at large when development restrictions apply only to a minority of the community. A case in point would be landholders being directed to preserve bushland areas for the enjoyment of the community at large.

(3) Evaluation of effectiveness of implementation techniques

- . To suggest and evaluate planning techniques and "tools" that may be particularly suited for use in rural areas to achieve stated objectives, e.g. transferable development rights, cluster houses on farms, differential ratings etc.

(4) Technical expertise

- . Assist in land use capability survey work and hence in the defining of land use potentials in key areas of land use conflict. This could result in the delineation of certain key areas of land for preservation from subdivision or conversely, those lands where the effects on agriculture of subdivision for rural living are least. Such land use capability information should put land development decision making on a sounder basis.
- . Maintain or improve environmental quality e.g. by minimising the effects of livestock pollution.
- . Preparation of agricultural activity guideline documents to assist and guide potential applicants in the performance standards required and to enable decision makers to assess particular applications to carry out a changed land use, e.g. guideline documents for the siting of piggeries etc.
- . To act as expert witnesses for the Crown in Planning Appeal Cases involving rural lands. SADAF's involvement should not be a routine one, but rather as a last resort.

11. REFERENCES CITED

- Adelaide Conference on Land Tenures (1974) - Proceedings of a Conference on the First Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Land Tenures - convened by Urban and Regional Planning Research Unit University of Adelaide.
- Archer, R.W. (1977) - A Bibliography on Rural Land Subdivision for Small Holding Land Uses in Australia, 1977. Staff Paper - Research Directorate - Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development, Canberra : Australia.
- Archer, R.W. (1977) - Policy and Research Issues, In Subdivisions for Rural Residences, Hobby Farms and Rural Retreats. Staff Papers - Research Directorate - Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development, Canberra : Australia.
- Australian Advisory Committee on the Environment (1974) - Land Use in Australia. Report No. 4.
- Australian Conservation Foundation (1975) - Landscape Conservation. Rural landscape conservation with particular reference to the rural - urban fringe. Paper of an ACF Conference, Canberra, 1975.
- Australian Government (1976) - Commission of Inquiry into Land Tenures - Final Report.
- Bird, F. (1977) - Farmlands or Urbanisation and Land Taxation: The Question of Choice. The Agricultural Technologist Journal. 8(3) : 19-22.
- Callaghan, Sir Allan (1973) - A review of the Department of Agriculture in the light of changed and changing needs. Government Printer, South Australia, Adelaide, December, 1973.
- Chittleborough, D.J., Maschmedt, D.J. & Wright, M.J. (1976) - Soils of the Monarto Town Site. Soil Survey - SS 16, 1976. Department of Agriculture and Fisheries and C.S.I.R.O. Division of Soils, Adelaide.
- Caldwell, J.M. (1977) - The Impact of Urban Spread on the Rural Producer - Family Farm. The Agricultural Technologist Journal 8(3) : 23-25.
- Collins, J. (1977) - The Relevance of the Concept of Transferable Development Rights. Working Paper - Adelaide Hills Study - Monarto Development Commission.
- Danforth, D.M., Jackson, V., Voth, D.E. and Hudson, G.T. (1977) - Attitudes Towards Planning and Management of Land Resources : Greene County, Arkansas. Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. Special Report 53.
- Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, South Australia (1977) - Submission to the Committee of Inquiry into the South Australian Dairy Industry. 8(3) : 19-22.

- Department of Lands, South Australia (1977) - Annual Report 1975-76.
- Else-Mitchell, R. (1977) - The Impact of Urban Spread on the Rural Producer - A Legal Viewpoint. *The Agricultural Technologist Journal*, 9(3) : 13-17.
- Harris, J., Lewkowicz, G., Miller, T.C. & Shepherd, K.J. (1976) - Report of the Committee on the Preservation of Land for Horticultural and Viticultural Use.
- Harris, C.R., Beare, J.A., Lewis, N.B., Roe, G.P. (1976) - Vegetation Clearance in South Australia. Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Vegetation Clearance.
- Hushak, L.J. (1976) - Costs of Land Use Planning. *Ohio Report* 61(4) : 54-56.
- Hutchings, A.W.J. et al. (1977) - Adelaide Hills Study. Stage 1. Monarto Development Commission.
- Jackson, V., Danforth, D.M., Voth, D.E. and Hudson, G.T. (1977) - Attitudes Towards Planning and Management of Land Resources : Howard County Arkansas. Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. Special Report 51.
- Jackson, V., Danforth, D.M., Voth, D.E. and Hudson, G.T. (1977) - Attitudes Towards Planning and Management of Land Resources : Lafayette County, Arkansas. Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. Special Report 52.
- Jay, C. (1977) - Hobby farms set a problem in rural subdivision. *Financial Review*, P. 25, 21/10/77.
- Jay, C. (1977) - Green Wedge Policies will Reshape Land Developments. *Financial Review*, P. 33, 28/10/77.
- Kelly, W.S. (1962) - Rural Development in South Australia. Rigby : Adelaide.
- Lewis, I.R. (1976) - Rural-Urban Land Use Conflict in the Adelaide Hills. A discussion paper on problems and possible solutions. Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, South Australia.
- McKinnon, W.A. (1977) - The Overall Impact of Tariffs and Subsidies. Address to Aust. Farm Man. Soc., 11th February, 1977.
- Planning and Development Act, 1966-1973 South Australia.
- Plowman, D.J. and Tysoe, T.R. (1977) - Working Paper on Primary Production Issues. Draft Report - Monarto Development Commission.
- Richmond, R.N. (1974) - Subdivision of Rural Land. Research Workpaper No. 10. Division of Marketing and Economics, N.S.W. Department of Agriculture.
- Rose, J.G. (1975) - The Transfer of Development Rights : An Interim Review of an Evolving Concept. In "Transfer of Development Rights". Edited by Rose, J.G. CUPR Rutgers.

- Sinden, J.A. (Editor) (1972) - The National Resources of Australia. Angus and Robertson - Sydney. Chapters 1, 2 & 3.
- South Australian State Planning Authority - Development Plans for Various Areas.
- Eyre Peninsula Area - Development Plan (1974).
- Flinders Ranges Planning Area - Development Plan (1973).
- Kangaroo Island Planning Area - Development Plan (1970).
- Metropolitan Adelaide Planning Study (1976).
- Metropolitan Development Plan. Supplementary Development Plan No. 4. The District Council of Willunga (1973).
- Metropolitan Development Plan. Supplementary Development Plan - Mount Lofty Ranges (1976).
- Mid-North Planning Area - Development Plan (1972).
- Mount Lofty Ranges Study (1974).
- Outer Metropolitan Planning Area Development Plan (1975).
- River Planning Area Development Plan (Draft).
- South East Planning Area - Development Plan (1970).
- Whyalla Planning Area Development Plan (1970).
- Yorke Peninsula Area Development Plan (Draft).
- Model Planning Regulations Country Planning Areas (1977).
- Trojan Owen & Associates (1975) - Guidelines for Public Consultation for Public Transport Planning. Director-General of Transport, South Australia.
- Wallman, N.F. (1976) - Rural Living Position Paper. Prepared for the Town Planning and Social Planning Divisions of the Monarto Development Commission.
- Williams, D.B. (Ed.) (1967) - Agriculture in the Australian Economy. Sydney University Press. Chapter 8 - Land Policy.