

Discussion Questions: Primary Industries

* Should the Code include a 40 metre interface buffer between rural and residential, but allow a smaller buffer distance if it can be justified?

I support the containment of the Urban Footprint - smaller distances should be resisted regardless of location/category. There will always be 'good reasons' for a 'reduced buffer area' in a whole range of circumstances and there will be the need for a process that will allow some encroachment BUT the 'bar must be set high'.

My experience' with the ongoing saga of the Fitzroy Tce/St Georges Nursing Home redevelopment, but consistent in principle with rural issues suggests that the 'Desired Policy Statement' is not considered by the Developers as an obstacle to redevelopment even though it is inconsistent with the Statement. (The matter is before the ERD) Reasons can always be found for the relaxation of policy.

* Does policy regarding subdivision and minimum allotment sizes need to be reviewed and strengthened?

I am not confident that strengthening the current provisions will be successful when the 'Developer', whether it be rural or suburban, has the financial capacity to conduct a lengthy dispute. It is quite clear that the Department and the Court is prepared to 'resolve' lengthy disputes on the basis of an acceptable 'degree of variance' from existing policy.

Discussion Question: Tourism

* Do we need to review our signage policies? In particular, do we need facilities for third party advertising and tourism advertising? For example, should there be more scope for tourism signs on arterial roads and outside of townships?

I do not consider that I am qualified to make a legitimate response to the question but would make the following comment based on personal experience:

Signage in the Barossa Valley, and in particular to wineries is inconsistent and difficult to see. Standards need to be set that are consistent with the area but also ensure that drivers can easily follow signage so that dangerous traffic conditions such as slowdowns and U-turns are minimised.

Discussion Question:

* Should undeveloped strategic mineral resources be identified and protected from urban encroachment and other incompatible development?

What is a 'strategic mineral resource'? Why just 'mineral'? Why aren't natural resources such as water, forests, and beaches subject to the same considerations?

Town planning/building development demonstrates how legislation can be amended to water down requirements so that urban or regional development criteria can be modified to suit the needs of the moment' with little regard to - or in spite of the future. Once again I would point out that the Courts have applied a 'not substantially at variance' approach consistent with the Act but what cannot be empirically qualified is the 'degree' of variance?

Discussion Question: (CENTRES, RETAIL and MIXED USE ACTIVITIES)

* Is there a need to retain the centres hierarchy or not - is it still relevant to today's planning?

Predicting, let alone understanding the direction of 'retail' over the next 30 years is a significant challenge. Online services and modes of delivery are at this point in time in flux.

Department stores are struggling with the competition of online retailers, while the major

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS PRODUCTIVE ECONOMY

food retailers are attempting to change shopping behaviour (with minimal success) but a generation or two of 'uber eats etc' will breakdown customer resistance.

The likelihood is that retail 'shops' will be more about the 'experience' especially with the likely demise of the 'Department Store'. Online shopping cannot replace the 'look/feel/try-on' experience that most shoppers are seeking, but the extent of online shopping into the future is not understood with any confidence.

At the time of writing Myer has announced that it will lease an entire floor of one of its stores as a car showroom, as it has recognised that it has too much floor space.

The perception is that current 'hierarchies' are not a fit with the future.

* Should there be residential development within retail centres? If so, how could / should this occur?

The major shopping centres should be seen as an opportunity to create public transport and business hubs providing car parks high -speed access to the city and other major employment zones.

It is recognised that 'arterial road' development includes commercial activities on the ground floor/street level and it would be inconsistent to exclude shopping centres/malls from this type of development.

Discussion Questions: 2.2 –Employment lands (industry, manufacturing and commercial)

* Should there be a more flexible approach to encouraging a wide range of land uses in non-residential zones – with a land use genus, impact and design focus, rather than strict land use definitions?

'encouraging a wide range of land uses' should be based on a case by case situation. Giving a 'blanket approval' to such a proposition, while recognising the procedural implications, should not be contemplated.

'flexibility' needs to be set within defined parameters so that over time the intent of the principle of 'flexibility' degrades into 'open slather'.

I would prefer to tighten the administrative application of 'flexible'!

Question 2.2

* Is there too much emphasis placed on height and setback criteria in employment lands zones, in particular the 'core' of these zones?

The problem is what is the alternative? Once again the issue is the 'degree of variance' of a proposal, which overtime will be eroded by a community 'living with' previous changes.

Discussion Questions: Sub theme 2.3 – Home-based businesses

* What innovations and changes to work practices will impact the planning system and how should we respond?

The capacity of new and emerging technology to operate a business from home, Café, Bus/Taxi needs to be better understood and should be considered against the entire 'knowledge industry' capability. The diminishing reliance on a 'traditional paper & pen' by supervising authorities (government departments/local government) needs to be better understood before an acceptable approach can be applied to the development of appropriate responses and procedures are established.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS PRODUCTIVE ECONOMY

The overriding concern is 'the workplace being in either' and cannot be isolated let alone attached to a '(specific)place'.

All of our present day legislation and administration practices have been based on the existence of a 'physical entity' whether it be a person, an organisation, a company etc this will not be the case in the future and pursuing let alone identifying a 'party which can sue or be sued' is uncertain. It raises the question of whether 'businesses' will be as anonymous as a 'Swiss bank account.'

Clear understanding and definition of the 'knowledge industry' concept needs to be established and strictly applied.

Discussion Question: 3.1 – Renewable energy

✦ How should planning policy respond to growth in renewable energy – what issues should be addressed?

The primary issue is the character of the 'renewable energy mechanism'.

Home solar collectors raise issues with respect to access of sunlight. Thermal springs/hot rock technology has issues similar to 'fracking' . Nuclear power generation cannot be ignored as many of our trading partners are already using this energy source. At the extreme end is 'cold fusion'. State Governments and Local Councils are not capable of dealing with these issues.

The issues of 'uranium mining' and 'export or import' of 'nuclear waste', all of which are relevant to South Australia require far more consideration before they are in any 'government policy' whither it be supportive or in opposition. Again I would question the ability of State Government to supervise/manage the security and safety of the 'industry'.

Discussion Question: 3.2 – Adaptive reuse

✦ Should existing unused farm houses be able to be separately titled to allow their adaptive reuse and to facilitate economic activity?

Is this really an issue? Is it an example of administrative practices locked into the past? I would question what is capable of being interpreted as 'adaptive reuse'.

Discussion Question: Infrastructure

✦ How can we ensure that land use planning is able to accommodate and support the provision of new and innovative infrastructure?

The problem that confronts legislators and administrators is that they are unsure/uncertain of the direction and nature of future development.

Many of the new technologies/Industries can by their nature operate within residential areas, (I suspect that such 'Industries' are doing so at present.) The challenge for legislators/administrators is to put in place measures and controls that reflect the type of the industries. While 'Hubs' where 'industries' of similar type are clustered allowing sharing of ideas, technology and 'tools', other 'industries' will exist in the 'ether' and the PC. Etc and can easily be absorbed into residential neighbourhoods. The challenge will be to identify this type of 'industry' and then consider how it can be identified let alone controlled. The impact on zones and how it can be controlled, given in many cases the perceived minimal footprint needs investigation and discussion.

As a crude example Uber uses technology by relying on potential customers and providers technology, as a consequence the technology relied on to the 'system' is minimal and mobile. It could be said that Uber owns very little of the infrastructure with the mobile phones of

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS PRODUCTIVE ECONOMY

users and providers along with the roads being 90%+ of the infrastructure needs of the service.

New industries based on technology rely on third party infrastructure.

At the same time legislators and administrators need to divorce themselves from 'factory thinking'. Developing/Building semiautonomous vehicles for example is 'old industry' thinking as the 'bolting together' of the components will also be new technology driven.

Discussion Questions: 4.1 – Collaboration and clustering

* Do we have adequate planning policies in place to encourage/support the aims of innovation districts?

The scale and functionality etc. of 'innovation districts' are unknown. Putting policies in place that accommodate 'blue sky' possibilities does not make for good policy and decision-making. The portability of 'knowledge industries' raises the prospect of 'here today-gone tomorrow'. The amendments made to the Planning and Development Regulations in the past two years demonstrates how easy it is to put in place the necessary 'instruments' to assist in the establishment of the aims and objectives of the 'innovators'.

I would err on the side of caution when it comes to putting in place legislative and administrative mechanisms for perceived or promised 'innovation'. I am not opposed to flexibility, but I do not pretend that I, or and Jane or Joe Average is able to perceive the future direction of 'new industries'.

* How do we ensure that residential development does not monopolise the offering in mixed-use areas of innovation districts?

The potential of 'residential development' to 'monopolise mixed use areas' has and will continue to be a problem, it is not a new issue and depends on sufficient residential allotments being available.(As an example the writer lives in a Nailsworth Street where there are three houses that were once shops and two residences now sit on land that was once the Post Office.) Residential development will fill the gap when businesses shut or move on. The problem with the 'knowledge economy' is that is highly mobile and high risk. Vacant areas, if not re-let quickly will become residential.

I am of the opinion of that the Discussion Paper ignores the transient nature of the 'new industries' and to a greater extent than previously the reliance (expectation?) government incentives in attracting the new industries with benefits/discounts etc.

The nomination of an area as an innovation district' can be a burden that the local community cannot support.

Discussion Questions: – E-Commerce and a sharing economy

* Does planning policy need to respond better to new ways of doing business such as the emergence of the sharing economy – which may require the introduction of controls to mitigate previously unanticipated effects (for example, the conversion of long term rentals into short stay holiday accommodation via online platforms)?

The emergence of E-Commerce as witnessed by Uber and the impact on the Taxi Industry especially the 'plate owners' demonstrates a dilemma. Government control of the Taxi

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS PRODUCTIVE ECONOMY

Industry was rendered irrelevant and the administration has been playing 'catch-up' ever since. 'Air BnB' presents a similar challenge. Controls can be put in place, but those controls are likely to be 'historical administrative measures' rather than a new approach that deals with the 'techno-commercial' reality.

* What will be the emerging industry impacts of e-Commerce and how should these be managed by the Code?

I am of the opinion that given the nature of the new industries that the 'Government Administration' will not be able to monitor the emerging industries it will be more than likely to have/use technology that is far more sophisticated and advanced than the government.

Managing by a 'code' is yesterday's thinking and far more discussion needs to be had as to understand how this new 'e' -industries can be monitored and held accountable.

Fred Morris

