



**Submission on  
NSW Government  
Agricultural Land Use Planning Strategy - Options Paper  
January 2021**



***Acknowledgement to Country***

*Byron Shire Council recognises the traditional owners of this land, the Bundjalung of Byron Bay, Arakwal people, the Widjabal people, the Minjungbul people and the wider Bundjalung Nation.*

*We recognise that the most enduring and relevant legacy Indigenous people offer is their understanding of the significance of land and their local, deep commitment to place.*

Dear Commissioner

Thank you for inviting Council to provide feedback on the Agricultural Land Use Planning Strategy (ALUS) Options Paper.

Overall, Byron Shire Council supports the need for an Agricultural Land Use Planning Strategy. We commend the Department of Primary Industries (DPI) in association with the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) for working with local government to address ongoing issues impacting agriculture in land use planning.

Our community recognises that for our farmers and other rural entrepreneurs to succeed, the development framework should support our existing strengths and emerging opportunities. Agricultural land protection alone will not deliver a viable agricultural sector. Experience tells us healthy and productive rural landscapes, engaged well-connected rural communities and efficient and reliable infrastructure are equally important.

Byron Shire Council, as with our neighbouring local government areas, are well advanced in land use planning measures to protect important farmland and ways to support our important agricultural sector.

The Northern Rivers Farmland Protections Project 2005 advocated via the North Coast Regional Plan 2036 and LGA local growth management strategies has placed this area in a sound land management position for over 15 years. Our good quality agricultural land (regionally- and state-significant) is protected under a RU1 Primary Production Zoning and generally a 40ha minimum subdivision lot size. Careful consideration, including engagement with our rural industry sector, ensures any changes to land uses in this zone or other zones in our rural areas enable a more secure, diverse and viable agricultural industry. The role out of the Far North Coast Environmental Zone review, with Byron Shire well advanced, delivers a new approach to environmental zoning on the Far North Coast to support farming and protect the environment.

On a daily basis Council staff (land use planners, environmental scientist, engineers, compliance officers and community development officers) engage with farmers, land care groups and the broader rural community. Assistance is broad; on-ground work, technical advice and supporting farmer well-being.

We appreciate other parts of the state may not be this well-advanced. In this context, our submission whilst responding to the options put forward by DPI, importantly seeks:

- an approach grounded in a collective sense of land custodial stewardship
- respect and recognition of traditional landowners deep knowledge of the land, harvesting food sustainably and how to care for and nourish land
- appreciation of the diversity within the farming sector and land with farming potential - hence policies to cater for and acknowledge diversity
- a response to emerging pressures/opportunities such as global trends and events, including climate change and regenerative farming
- recognition of the role and value of Council rural land use strategies with continued allowances for local responses and provisions
- acknowledgement that state regulations and policies outside agriculture affect the right to farm and access to farmland.

We would welcome the opportunity work with DPI as well as the DPIE on ways to elevate the ALUS scope within the Northern Rivers. We consider our area to be poised to take agricultural land use planning initiatives to the next level and the next generation.

In preparing this feedback we are networked with:

- Byron Shire Strategic Business Panel
- Agricultural Cluster Group a local advisory group of farmers
- Byron Farming Network (local producers and land holders).

We also notified key groups in our rural sector of the options paper availability.

The following provides the explanation to the above request

Abbreviation references in table:

BRLUS – Byron Rural Land Use Strategy

NCRP – North Coast Regional Plan

NRFPP Northern Rivers Farmland Protection Project

| Our ref  | Issues area - option in paper  | Support the option | Why/why not?   | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?                      | What changes might make the solution more effective?   |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
|  | Column reference               | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A  | B  | C  |
| <b>Chapter 1: Minimise the loss of productive capacity</b> |                                |                    |  |  |  |
|  | <b>Non statutory</b>           |                    |  |  |  |
| 1.1  | Rural Land Use Planning Policy | ✓                  | Due to the NRFPP mapping and NCRP, the principles as identified on page 7 of the option paper are essentially in practice in Byron Shire and reflected in the BRLUS. | Only be effective if the state government, mining and tourism sectors are also bound by the terms of the policy. | <p>Retaining land is only part of the solution. Measures need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– manage tenure/market price for rural land in localities where lifestyle living is highly desirable</li> <li>– support farmers who enhance farmland/produce by being more in sync with healthy environments such as vegetating watercourses and naturalised wind breaks.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p><i>R(i)</i> Two principles added:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Non-agricultural land uses in rural areas should not undermine long-term viable ongoing access to productive farmland.</li> <li>– Agricultural land should be maintained with the view to supporting enhanced quality of agricultural land and farm productivity using natural area environmental restoration/enhancement measures and regenerative practices.</li> </ul> |

| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper       | Support the option | Why/why not?  | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?  | What changes might make the solution more effective?   |
|---------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---|--|--|
|         | Column reference                    | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A   | B  | C  |
| 1.2     | Option 1. Identify Production Areas | ✓                  | <p>Mapping is a familiar tool to planners and farmers with the capacity to layer in spatial information at a regulatory level.</p> <p>Need to be flexible and regularly reviewed as what may be productive in an area now may not be in the future. For example Northern Rivers has transitioned overtime from logging to dairy &amp; bananas to macadamias and emerging horticulture, nursery and bush tucker.</p> | <p>Will be effective if the mapping of land is not solely reliant on past European farming practices and identification of farmland.</p> <p>Effective if done on the ground rather than from a desk in Sydney. Prime land classifications from based on mapping at a high scale (1:40,000) has the capacity to be too simplified and lacking in local context.</p> <p>Productive land mapping should be informed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– guidance from traditional owners on knowledge how to integrate Aboriginal farming and land care techniques</li> <li>– role of ecosystem services provided from surrounding natural areas</li> <li>– emerging agriculture and capacity of agricultural land</li> <li>– agriculture being sustainable/viable amidst climate change impacts/opportunities.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Identification of production areas gives consideration to:</p> <p><i>R(ii)</i> a blended capability analysis framework, similar to the recreational opportunity spectrum or the ultimate environment threshold analysis techniques.</p> <p><i>R(iii)</i> grading production types on their capacity to address /manage climate change. Agriculture that places less environmental demands (such as need for water or chemical control) or are climate change resilient could be prioritised over high impact/ demand agriculture. Such as comparing bamboo to cotton production as a source of fibre, or natural grassland feed stock to feedlot.</p> <p><i>R(iv)</i> facilitating productive area transitioning to more resilient agriculture. Include assessment of probable risks and mitigation of impacts relating to bushfire, flooding, biosecurity, pest plagues.</p> <p><i>R(v)</i> a framework to help buffer core production areas or to accommodate complementary land uses – this could include organic farming enclaves.</p> <p><i>R(vi)</i> protecting or enhancing important crop/animal production areas with management/education on</p> |

| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper                            | Support the option | Why/why not?  | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?  | What changes might make the solution more effective?  |
|---------|--|--------------------|---|--|---|
|         | Column reference   | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A   | B  | C   |
|         |  |                    |   | – Work force availability and upskilling services in the locality, where relevant.   | urban area backyard garden, roadway and parkland practices.   |
| 1.3     | Option 2. Monitoring and Reporting of Loss of Rural Land | ✓                  | <p>Support only on the basis that monitoring the 'loss' of this land would be carried out by DPI as this is not a cost nor technical area appropriate to local government.</p> <p>Reiterate comments in R (iv) above.</p> | <p>Rezoning is not the sole cause of agricultural land loss. Rezoning can be refused/ regulated with a sound strategic planning.</p> <p>In Byron Shire loss is more likely due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the expansive range of non-agricultural land uses permitted in the rural zones</li> <li>– more silent threats to long term farmland such as a house on rural land in a scenic/desirable location, which can see the land transition from a farm to a rural lifestyle property and the resulting escalation of land values that make it unlikely to ever return to farming uses</li> <li>– environmental degradation /climatic change.</li> </ul> | <p>Productive land should not only be seen as area of typically mono-culture cropping or animal production.</p> <p>Certain public infrastructure can integrate with agriculture such as energy generation (e.g. wind farms and biogas capture) or sewerage treatment plants (recycled water sources for non-food crops). Byron Shire Council currently merges its Bangalow sewerage waste plant with bamboo growing.</p> <p>Need to support a better connection between production - land capacity – ecosystem services. For example eucalyptus forests can be productive growing shitake mushrooms, housing beekeeping, whilst also providing habitat for endangered species such as koalas. In urban areas and peri urban areas, urban farms are a source of local produce whilst being heat island offsets within the urban areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>R(vii)</i> Suggest this is rephrased to a positive statement. As worded, it is embedded in a view that 'we have what we have' – it should include measuring (and</p> |

| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper   | Support the option | Why/why not?  | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?  | What changes might make the solution more effective?   |
|---------|---|--------------------|---|--|--|
|         | <b>Column reference</b>   | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A   | B  | C  |
|         |   |                    |   |  | actively encourage) gains in productive land within the context of produce basins or local food sheds.   |
| 1.4     | Option 3. Education   | ✓                  | Support – however needs to recognise that within the pool of planners there are planners that are also farmers and/or very attune to the nuisances of farming in their local area; the education should not be condescending or ‘top down’ and instead should be a two way flow with the DPI. |  | See recommendation R (vi)  |
|         | <b>Statutory planning framework</b>   |                    |   |  |  |
| 1.5     | Option 4. State Agricultural Land Use Planning Policy   | ✓                  | Essentially such a policy already operates in the North Coast Area for regionally significant farmland.   | A per comment in 1.3B above  | As per comment 1.2 C   |
|         | — Amend Ministerial Local Planning Direction 1.5 - Rural Lands to require planning proposals for non-agricultural land use on rural land, or changes to planning controls for rural zoned land to consider agricultural planning principles/ criteria and/or the findings of an agricultural impact statement (AIS);<br>— Amend the PPRD SEPP | Unsure             | Concern as to how rural land may be defined – need to ensure this pertains to ‘rural zoned’ land and the provisions accommodate the interface with Environmental zoned land, as many rural properties share a mix of both zones.  | Any reliance on what could be seen as a mutually exclusive approach to rural land use (i.e. if it is non-agricultural the development has to undergo significant assessment on a case by case basis) could impede the ability of farmers to quickly respond to market opportunities, down turns or an impacting climate change event. Farms as businesses, need to quickly adapt | <b>Recommendation</b><br><i>R(viii)</i> The application of the policy and any supporting provisions – need to ensure:<br><br>a. that an assessment looks at any potential cumulative impacts to farming/agricultural land, local/regional economy and environment and where negative avoided or mitigated<br>b. it addresses how farms provide services to other farms or how the natural environment provides ecosystem services to farms (such as natural pest |

| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper   | Support the option   | Why/why not?  | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?   | What changes might make the solution more effective?  |
|---------|---|----------------------|---|---|---|
|         | <b>Column reference</b>   | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO        | A   | B   | C   |
|         | <p>and/or the Standard Instrument LEP to require consideration of suitable alternative locations, the preparation and consideration of an AIS or, depending on scale, a land use conflict risk analysis for non-agricultural land uses on rural land</p> <p>— Amend the PPRD SEPP and/or clause 5.16 of the Standard Instrument LEP to more clearly require consideration of whether potential impacts on agriculture from proposed non-agricultural development have been minimised.</p> |                      |   | <p>to changes in order to maintain/bolster income.</p> <p>Byron Shire is working with the rural sector to identify appropriate target alternative non-agricultural uses. As a case in example in Aug 2020 a rural events framework was adopted by Council. In this instance Council undertook the broader assessment on suitable alternative locations and the consideration of agricultural impacts, scale, land use conflict risk analysis for the uses. The provisions set a transparent, consistent and expedited way for farms to apply and be assessed.</p> | <p>control)</p> <p>c. scope for local Councils to set planning provisions for temporary non-agricultural uses, such as rural events (e.g. wedding) that may be utilised to support overall farm income.</p> |
| 1.6     | Option 4a. State Agricultural Land Use Planning Policy and State Significant Agricultural Land Criteria   | Least preferred<br>✗ | <p>This option relies on councils conducting their own mapping if desired. It is considered councils would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– have limited funds and skills to undertake this work.</li> <li>– be susceptible to local political trends that operative on a 3 -4 year election cycle.</li> </ul> | -   | -   |



| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper  | Support the option | Why/why not?   | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?   | What changes might make the solution more effective?  |
|---------|--|--------------------|--|---|---|
|         | <b>Column reference</b>  | ✓ YES<br>x NO      | A  | B   | C   |
| 1.7     | Option 4b. State Agricultural Land Use Planning Policy and State Significant Agricultural Land Map                   | Preferred<br>✓     | Byron Shire is essentially operating on this option currently - Far North Coast and Mid-North Coast Important Farmland Map (both regional and state significant farmland). However it is important to have a consistent and compulsory policy framework that applies across the state. | To remain effective the process needs to allow for a DPI review on a regular basis or at the request of a Council (e.g. due to special circumstance such as impacts of climate change)  | <b>Recommendation</b><br><br><i>R(ix)</i> Review inclusion of irrigated land (and dams) within a stressed water cycle system – this may not be a viable option for the future if water is to be retained for the continued operation of natural systems, which may be important to other types of farms and fishery resources. Greater consideration could be given to proximity of recycled water sources.<br><br><i>R(x)</i> Review the Options paper list of lands as is based on a largely finite in supply approach that does not embrace new production techniques or climate change response. As a case in example, Byron Shire is working with the rural sector to identify capacity to utilise recycled urban water. This has the potential to better use land, previously not suited to many farm uses due to water access limitations. |
| 1.8     | Option 4c. State Agricultural Land Use Planning Policy and State Significant Agricultural Land Map - councils opt in | Second preferred   | Like 4a, this option is susceptible to local political trends that operate within each election cycle. The agricultural sector needs long term land use security and certainty, particularly as it is vulnerable to market and climate   | Rural land management is best achieved through catchment-based land use planning. Local government boundaries often do not align with catchment boundaries, or with regional economies. | <i>R(xi)</i> Develop a consistent and compulsory policy framework that applies across the state.<br><br><i>R(xii)</i> As a preferred option it would work better if a group of LGAs within a catchment area (natural and/or economic) are encouraged /required to   |

| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper   | Support the option | Why/why not?  | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?  | What changes might make the solution more effective?  |
|---------|---|--------------------|---|--|---|
|         | <b>Column reference</b>   | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A   | B  | C   |
|         |   |                    | fluctuations. The capital investment and growing time of certain crops relies on long term investment security, macadamia trees as a case in point.   |  | work together on local controls suited to their combined LGA catchment.   |
| 1.9     | <p>Option 5. Controlling Land Use in Rural Zones</p> <p>Types of statutory changes to prohibit non-agricultural development on SSAL or in rural areas generally:</p> <p>a Ministerial Direction which requires SSAL to be zoned RU1 Primary Production when councils prepare a planning proposal applying to the land.</p> <p>b Ministerial Direction which prohibits the change of zoning of rural zoned land to a residential, business, industrial, environmental or special use zone.</p> | <p>✓</p> <p>✗</p>  | <p>a. A preference to retain current provisions for the North Coast under Section 9.1 Direction 5.3. Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast Farmland of State and Regional Significance on the NSW Far North Coast.</p> <p>b. Council has recently adopted 3 LGMS' and a LSPS prepared consistent with these documents, with; 2 of the LGMS' endorsed by the DPIE. The changes proposed could substantially impact these forward planning documents. In addition, the provisions fail to address the environmental zone changes currently delivered as part of Council's Environmental Zone review process.</p> <p>c. Byron Shire is experiencing</p> | <p>a- Yes as it currently informs zoning determination in the Northern Rivers.</p> <p>b. Should not be hard and fast rule - the current position in on the Northern Rivers Farmland Protection Project - Final Recommendations, February 2005, which states as part of council-initiated strategic investigations over a nominated settlement area has merit in enabling overall regional strategic direction for other land uses on Rural zoned land that is not SSAL such as that close to towns.</p> <p>c. Unless the SI LEP is amended</p> | <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>R(xiii)</i> Allowance for a change of zoning of rural zoned land to a residential, business, industrial, environmental (see R(xiv) following) or special use zone where supported under a as part of one-off council-initiated strategic investigations over a nominated settlement area which has merit in terms of other planning issues and the overall regional strategic direction .</p> <p><i>R(xiv)</i> Support and strengthen implementation of the Far North Coast Environmental Zone review project and on-going delivery.</p> <p><i>R(xv)</i> A Standard Instrument LEP to prohibit particular non-agricultural land uses in the RU1 Primary Production zone should apply to all SSAL, while RU1 zones outside SSAL need to have scope with economic/agricultural regional variation.</p> <p><i>R(xvi)</i> Any Standard Instrument LEP to limit subdivision</p> |

| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper   | Support the option | Why/why not?   | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?   | What changes might make the solution more effective?   |
|---------|---|--------------------|--|---|--|
|         | <b>Column reference</b>   | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A  | B   | C  |
|         | <p>c Amend the Standard Instrument LEP to prohibit particular non-agricultural land uses in the RU1 Primary Production zone.</p> <p>d Amend the Standard Instrument LEP to prohibit any further subdivision of rural land to create new lots with dwelling eligibilities.</p> | <p>✓</p> <p>✗</p>  | <p>gradual transition way form large broad hectare agriculture to more niche industries such as cut flower, alpaca farms, native products and bush food. Increasingly small holdings are viable with intensive horticultural production. As well as land use diversification and product value adding at the farm gate. Whilst Council supports prohibiting particular non-agricultural land uses in the RU1 Primary Production zone, State wide standardising may compromise local growth sectors unless some degree of flexibility is built in.</p> <p>d. Share farming and community title, in appropriate locations, can be effective in maintaining and/or accessing farming. Collective farming models like this enable people to share skills, experience and farming equipment to improve operational viability.</p> | <p>to prohibit many of the non-agricultural land uses that are currently permitted in the RU1 zone, there is little chance that the next generation of farmers will be able to access such land for genuine farming pursuits. Given the finite (and ever-decreasing) amount of SSAL on the Far North Coast, these areas should only be able to be used for primary production purposes under an appropriate zoning (i.e. not for tourism, weddings, etc. .Outside the SSAL managing land use options need to be cognitive of the agricultural industry base on the region.</p> <p>d. there is no point in having land without a next generation of farmers being supported to access land and develop skills. In Byron Shire farms are not generally operated by large farming corporations, as occurs in other areas of the state. Also, need to distinguish between</p> | <p>and/or prohibit dwellings should have regard to the potential economic impact on overall properties values in popular lifestyle areas and knock on effects to new generation farmers accessing affordable farmland.</p> |

| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper  | Support the option             | Why/why not?   | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?   | What changes might make the solution more effective?  |
|---------|--|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
|         | <b>Column reference</b>  | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO                  | A  | B   | C   |
|         |  |                                |  | further subdivision of State/<br>Regionally significant farmland<br>-vs- other rural land.  |   |
| 1.10    | Option 6a. DPI <b>approval</b> of developments on SSAL and IPAs<br><b>or</b><br>Option 6b. DPI <b>advice</b> in relation to development on SSAL and IPAs | Advice agency preferred option | The development assessment approval process takes into consideration matters apart from the agricultural significance of land. | Could be effective should parameters be set for circumstances where development of non-agricultural uses require DPIE and DPI advice. | <b>Recommendation</b><br><br><i>R(xvii)</i> Set parameters for development of non-agricultural uses warranting either advice or approval referral and time limits on response from DPI & DPIE response.<br><br><i>R(xviii)</i> If DPIE and DPI are to be approval agencies they are to be accountable for appeal actions based on their 'approval' determination. |

| Our ref   | Issues area - option in paper  | Support the option | Why/why not?       | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue? | What changes might make the solution more effective?   |
|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|---|--|
|   | Column reference   | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A                  | B   | C  |
| <b>Chapter 2: Reduce and manage land use conflict</b> |  |                    |                    |   |  |
| 2.1   | Options to improve Operational dispute resolution<br><u>Option 1.</u> Expand the jurisdiction of existing dispute resolution bodies<br><u>Option 2.</u> Create a new dispute resolution body<br><u>Option 2a.</u> Ontario Normal Farm Practices Protection Board / British Columbia Farm Industry Review Board - Model A<br><u>Option 2b.</u> Ontario Normal Farm Practices Protection Board / Wollondilly Rural Industry Community Advisory Committee – Model B<br><u>Option 2c.</u> Queensland Land Access Ombudsman Model<br><u>Option 3.</u> Create a new or expanded agricultural disputes jurisdiction in a court or tribunal. |                    | See recommendation | See recommendation  | <b>Recommendation</b><br><i>R(xix)</i> For all options:<br>a. require more information - uncertainty in administrative matters such as timeframes for the resolution of disputes, the threshold for referral, and the management of confidentiality.<br>b. look to the future and expand to include water resources. |

| Our ref   | Issues area - option in paper                                | Support the option | Why/why not?   | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue?   | What changes might make the solution more effective?   |
|---|--|--------------------|--|---|--|
|   | Column reference   | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A  | B   | C  |
| <b>Chapter 3: Support agriculture to recover and grow</b> |  |                    |  |   |  |
| 3.1   | Option 1. Clarification of agricultural land use definitions | ✓                  |  | Support a definitions review to more accurately reflect the impacts of development. With focus on outcomes and embed flexibility in the definitions to respond to changing practices.   | <b>Recommendation</b><br><br><i>R(xx)</i> Consider incorporating definitions linked with best practice requirements/h performance assessment benchmarks, such as where visual, spray and lighting impacts are anticipated.<br><i>R(xxi)</i> Consider defining types of plantation forestry for carbon sequestration that may have irreversibly impact on the soil characteristics and the productive capacity.                                       |
| 3.2   | Option 2. Expansion of exempt and complying developments     | ✓                  | Allows for more localised response.  | Support use of precincts where local authorities are trying to develop industry aggregations. This could include bespoke zoning or overlay maps.  | -  |
| 3.3   | Option 3. Buffer guidelines                                  | ✓                  | The BRLUS has an action to prepare such guidelines for uses in this Shire. | <p>Yes if the buffer provisions keep pace with industry practice.</p> <p>Implementing buffers requires an up to date data base on actual farmland use – at a strategic level Byron Shire has been using commercial farmland rating return information for this purpose.</p> <p>Road networks should also be considered.</p> | <b>Recommendation</b><br><br><i>R(xxii)</i> In setting buffer need to recognise the difference between free range/natural pasture activities and grain feed.<br><br><i>R(xxiii)</i> Buffers need to consider key transportation routes where farm operations are on a 24 hour basis -changes or traffic that could adversely affect practices such as stock grazing or stock movement/ routes adjacent road corridors; increased road dust on crops. |

| Our ref | Issues area - option in paper                           | Support the option | Why/why not?   | Do you think the solution will be effective in mitigating or addressing the relevant issue? | What changes might make the solution more effective?  |
|---------|---|--------------------|--|---|---|
|         | <b>Column reference</b>                                 | ✓ YES<br>✗ NO      | A  | B   | C   |
|         | Option 3. Buffer guidelines cont'd                      |                    |  |   | <p><i>R(xxiv)</i> Buffers need to have provision for flexibility to help manage climate events and biosecurity risks – e.g. stock moved into buffer areas for their safety or due to temporary loss of usual grazing land.</p> <p><i>R(ix)</i> In setting buffer for intensive horticulture need to maintain lot sizes of sufficient area to allow for effective separation between the horticulture activities and adjacent sensitive land uses.</p> |
| 3.4     | Option 4. Agent of change/initiator of change principle | Unsure             | <p>As the agent of change may be a new agricultural use or agricultural traffic, in an area where there are rural lifestyle dwellers living on rural zoned land.</p> <p>Agree if the agent of change pertains to an agricultural use impacting on an established agricultural use.</p> | Yes   | <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><i>R(x)</i> As with buffers need to set a framework where agricultural operations are awarded priority.</p>   |
| 3.5     | Option 5. Amend regulation on public submissions        | ✓                  | -  | -   | -   |

### Further comment: capacity for the past 'zoning' framework to deliver good land use planning outcomes

Zones and land use are impacted by regulation and policy outside the LEP standard template. The ALUS Option Paper concerns regarding agricultural 'zoned' land's core objective/value being eroded holds parallels with other zones such as the residential zone.

Historically having an objective/intent to provide housing for permanent resident housing the residential zones are also being eroded/diversified to accommodate a broader range of development types such as:

- short-term rental accommodation for tourists leading to potentially conflicting uses being clustered together
- work/run a business from home.

Diversification/erosion of outcomes (depending on your view) outside a planning framework, reliant on a one size fits template and facilitated by the NSW government's short-term election policy framework is conducive to poor long term outcomes. This ALUS reflects a step in the right direction offering long term strategic land use considerations and growth management to weigh up economic, social and environmental opportunities, costs, risk and intergenerational equity needs.

The ground work in the ALUS options paper is appreciated and warranted. However a fundamental question revolves around the capacity for 'zones' of the past to deliver the good planning outcomes needed for the future in the context of:

- a need for more secure local food, produce and water supply sources
- farmers increasingly merging farm management with enhanced environmental outcomes such as waterway restoration, habitat planting to diminish land degradation or accommodating a solar farm or wind farm
- current Australian/NSW farms and farmland being feasible in the face of climate change and its effects on water, land, temperature, air pollution etc.
- global mega trends or events
- capacity to link a farm workforce on a seasonal basis
- individual and businesses alike embracing new income/business models to deliver funding for their needs
- individual and businesses alike embracing new land tenure models to deliver farmland
- mining sector largely remaining outside the standard land use planning framework even though it can significantly impact land values and agricultural production.

Zoning provisions needs to be drastically simplified. Tenure and property rights over valuable and increasingly scarce resources of land and water need to be revisited. Incentivising the preservation of the resource requires adaptations at the local/regional level in way that creates an environment of equity, certainty, predictability, and greater flexibility. Designing the right kind of Strategy is paramount. This process needs to avoid regulation and decisions that depend entirely on views of people in power. A successful Strategy requires continued involvement of local governments, farmers and rural community in recognizing conflicting points of view in collaborative and participatory processes