



## *Planning for Sustainable Animal Industries*

Mornington Peninsula Shire Council

Submission

October 2017

The Mornington Peninsula Shire council generally welcomes the proposed policy and provision changes, released by the Department of Economic Development, Jobs, Transport and Resources (DEDJTR), as part of the review of planning controls for sustainable animal industries.

*The following issues and areas of concern outlined by the MPSC in regards to the current proposal should be addressed or reviewed as part of the process:*

- First and foremost, Mornington Peninsula Shire Council consider the additional land use terms to be premature given a General Code of Practice and Industry Specific Technical Guidelines to compliment the notice and review exemptions are yet to be established.
- It is considered any proposed changes to land use terms should be a result from the Code of Practice, with any associated changes taken into consideration prior to any planning scheme amendment.
- The additional land use terms are considered to be beneficial to the future management of the Green Wedge Zone (the primary zone found within the Mornington Peninsula Shire affected by the changes), although the specific benefits or limitations of such proposed terms cannot be determined at this early stage.
- Additional, clearer land use terms will enable better planning processes and enable different scales of proposals to be assessed at different levels. The current situation of a blanket approach results in poor outcomes and planning decisions.
- It is recommended greater flexibility be allowed within the planning scheme in regards to categorising a specific land use term. For example, some low intensity operations of poultry or pig farming may be better assessed as 'grazing animal production' opposed to 'poultry farm' or 'pig farm'.
- Whilst the proposed definitions are useful in regards to categorising specific land uses, the type and size of any operation, it is considered the proposed supplementary feeding definitions may be vague and difficult to implement. The introduction of 'emergency feeding', 'seasonal feeding' and 'supplementary feeding' will be difficult to monitor and enforce from council's perspective. The additional definitions allow operations to take advantage of the flexibility of each definition and be categorised incorrectly.

- Action 4 proposes to introduce permit, notice and third party review exemptions for small scale, low risk pig farms and poultry farms (including broiler farms) which can result in these proposals being a Section 1 use (no permit required) in the Farming Zone, Green Wedge Zone or Rural Activity Zone, if certain conditions are met. The conditions will be specific to each type, pig or poultry farms.
- MPSC anticipate the removal of third party rights to be problematic given there is no established Code of Practice. It is considered premature to introduce exemptions.
- The Government has clearly indicated that a review of the Code of Practice and the development of technical guidelines is required to better refine the size thresholds and setback parameters. It is important that this process precedes the exemptions to be able to better understand any amenity impacts or implications.
- One such concern is that that all poultry farms that do not fit into the 'streamlined' categories will continue to be assessed under the broiler farm code regardless of whether they can be rightly defined as a broiler farm.
- It is unclear on what basis the setbacks have been derived and whether due consideration has been given to the implications of these setbacks. The proposed 100 metre setback, while consistent with other setbacks in zones, needs greater scientific consideration in terms of the setbacks appropriateness for different farming intensities and also ability to mitigate potential impacts of odour and waste. It is unclear why the setbacks for grazing animals should have a different implementation criteria than poultry and pig farms (setbacks from feeding infrastructure versus from animals).
- It is unclear if there has been any research into amenity impacts and setback requirements of a moveable 'roaming' style shed for free range production opposed to a fixed shed. The implications to adjoining properties of a fixed shed may be far greater than a roaming style shed. The opportunity for flexibility to setbacks must be considered for alternative scenarios.
- The conditions on the small scale pig enterprises appear to contradict best practice breeding systems by only allowing progeny of stock already on the land. Further consideration on the wording of these parameters are needed to ensure they are in line with the needs of small scale pig farms

- Furthermore, in relation to poultry farms, officers consider that the proposed reforms need further review to ensure that low risk small scale enterprises can still operate on small land holdings that may not be able to operate if compliance with the new setbacks is required.
- It is unclear if there has been any scientific or logical thought to the lack of consideration of stock density for poultry, or the proposed stocking density for pigs (i.e. number of poultry or pigs per square metre). The potential amenity impacts of poultry and pigs is greatly dependent on the stocking density and so it is important this is properly considered and justified.
- As there are very few standards that will be applied to the exempt categories, there is a possibility that farms will start small and 'evolve' to become greater in size and impact. Without any requirements to meet siting requirements, for example like those in the Broiler Farm Code of Practice, significant impacts and public angst are anticipated. This places a considerable enforcement burden on councils to be constantly monitoring small operators.
- It is considered that the proposed changes to the planning system are generally well informed and will enable better management of amenity impacts.