

# Tuesday 17/1/12

---

**Gordon Sykes, Arborist** (891ABC 16.06-16.19) Significant tree legislation

**Smyth:** *With the recent economic downturn it seems to have been much easier than it has been for a while at least to find a subbie to do building work around the place ... but have you tried to get a tree surgeon? Business is booming and it's all thanks to new legislation that came into effect a couple of months ago meaning you no longer need council approval to remove most trees up to three metres in girth ... the word is that the rush is on to pull them out all over Adelaide, right across the state in fact since that legislation changed but the thing is it's under review again, public submissions close next week on this, State Parliament about to look at the legislation again to see whether it needs a little bit of tweaking here and there. Gordon Sykes ... in simple terms can you explain to us how the legislation changed late last year?*

**Gordon Sykes:** ... significant trees are now any tree that has a circumference one metre above the ground of three metres or more, any tree between two metres and three metres circumference is now called a regulated tree. A regulated tree can be removed without the need to engage a consulting arborist, councils must undertake the assessment themselves and therefore you still have to put in a development application to remove those trees.

**S:** *But the situation is far less complicated than it would have been say, six months ago, it's much more straightforward, presumably thousands of trees would now be determined as regulated rather than protected?*

**GS:** That's correct ... also part of ... the amended regulations ... is any tree, it doesn't matter what size it is, that is within 10 metres of a dwelling or an in ground swimming pool can be removed without council approval as long as it's not a eucalyptus tree or a *Agonis flexuosa*, which is the West Australian willow myrtle ... those two types of trees are still basically fairly well protected.

**S:** *... this is where the bone of contention is because there are a couple of varieties of trees that ... sort of just fall outside that protected area that some consider should be protected?*

**GS:** That's correct, some may, some may not for example the very common lemon scented gum and spotted gums are known as *Corymbia* not known as eucalypt so therefore they can be removed ... you can imagine how many big lemon scented gums and spotted gums around Adelaide are being removed at the moment just because they're within 10 metres of a dwelling.

**S:** *We saw that one on television last week ... the council at Henley Beach ... decided not to take any action because ... it was within 10 metres of the property and didn't come under the protection order?*

**GS:** That's correct, had he removed that prior to the 17<sup>th</sup> of November he could have been prosecuted up to \$120,000 for that.

**S:** *So presumably these changes have been good business for you as an arborist?*

**GS:** No not for me as a consulting arborist, for tree removal companies yes. As a consulting arborist my business has actually declined because councils are now not allowed to ask the client or the customer or the applicant who wants to remove a tree to supply an arborist report

supporting the tree's removal ... therefore people don't need to get an arborist as much as they used to.

**S:** *Do you think that changes need to be made to legislation?*

**GS:** Yes, definitely, there's far too many trees going to be removed ... nice jacarandas, oak trees, elm trees, and lots of other trees like that just because they're within 10 metres of a dwelling can be chopped down ... that's over the top ... there's far too many nice trees that will be gone.

**S:** *Why ... are people so keen to get the chainsaw out do you think?*

**GS:** I think a tree in the backyard can, under the old legislation, even the new one, can prevent development because you can't build too close to a tree, you've got to allow to protect the tree, you must have tree protection zones so therefore it limits some development, people are frightened of falling limbs and things like that ... if they'd brought in an arborist in the first place you may find that most arborists do what they can to protect the tree ... saying things such as let's get the tree pruned or let's do some management on the tree ... it will at least protect the tree and still provide the essential need the environment requires.

**S:** *So you're getting the impression that people are rushing in while the legislation is as it is before these submissions are accepted and reviewed by Parliament in case things change yet again?*

**GS:** Yeah to a certain extent ... several tree companies are ringing me up every day saying, is it okay to remove this tree or one this morning, can you remove a Moreton Bay fig tree ... the Moreton Bay fig is about nine metres from the back of the house so yes it's coming down.

**S:** *... some of those are enormous ... trees around Botanic Gardens, Botanic Park ...*

**GS:** Yeah ... those trees like that are okay because they're not near a dwelling ... or in ground swimming pool ... trees in parklands, the Botanic Gardens of course and grounds of hospitals and things they still have to get approval to be removed. In your own backyard no they don't.

**S:** *... do you get quite emotional about these things when you see some of these magnificent old trees purely because they're close to a property being pulled down?*

**GS:** That's correct, yeah ...no one in the South Australian Society of Arboreal Culture or ... Arboreal Culture Australia want to see trees removed. We've also got enough sense to realise that if some trees are dangerous yes they should be removed.

**S:** *... stay with us.*

**Bob Such, Independent Member for Fisher** (891ABC 16.12-16.20) Significant tree legislation

**Smyth:** *Bob Such ... where are things at with this legislation and the review process, bring us up to speed.*

**Bob Such:** ... the overarching Act went through Parliament 2009 and since then regulations have been drawn up ... the Act is sort of the umbrella legal provision and the regulations fit under that ... those regulations were adopted in the ... Government gazette in November ... I agree they need some tweaking and tomorrow a group of arborists and myself are meeting with either the Minister John Rau or his senior people to offer some constructive views about how

the regulations can be improved ... most of what's in the regulations is fine, we're not saying it's totally wrong, but a couple of concerns for example ironically it prevents the removal of any eucalypt when clearly some eucalypts, and there's about 800 of them, some of them may have been planted inappropriately too close to a house or whatever and shouldn't get automatic total protection ... think of the Tasmanian blue gum for example which can be a very large tree and people planted them years ago as a little sapling and now they are monsters ... under the current regulations they are protected and ironically one willow myrtle, *Agonis flexuosa*, is also protected, I'm not sure why, but that list needs to be refined ... what we're going to put tomorrow is a suggestion the eucalypts that get the proper full protection be those that are indigenous to the Adelaide area, not something from Tasmania that may or may not be appropriately planted ... that's one issue of concern, the others are the definition of the dwelling and the precise location of that ... the courts have had some issues with that in the past too. There's definitions of tree damaging activity for example it says that you can prune 30% ... 30% today and, what, another 30% tomorrow ... that needs to be tightened up ... one of the fundamental problems and it has occurred from day one when I chaired the original committee that looked at essentially trying to protect river red gums and it has done that, the large ones to a large extent, it has done the job but what happened in the intervening years and this is what caused the new Act to be introduced and the regulations is that some councils went over the top and anything that was green got protected ... that was never the original intention.

**S:** *Does this legislation apply to all councils by the way?*

**BS:** ... these particular provisions relate essentially to the Adelaide metropolitan area because in country areas outside the townships you've got the Native Vegetation Act, but this is primarily in relation to the whole of the metropolitan area and parts of the City of Playford within the water shed zone and parts of the Adelaide Hills Council, parts of Mount Barker and so on, but essentially it's the metropolitan area ... but one of the underlying problems over time has been that ... size isn't necessarily the only worthwhile aspect of a tree ... if you only protect the biggies you will eventually have no biggies because you won't have the smaller trees ... that's one deficiency that in effect has continued on ... also there's no protection in the metropolitan area apart from the Hills Face Zone which comes under the conservation provisions of Native Vegetation ...

**Caller John:** ... *I'm totally opposed to the whole thing ... if you've got a tree in your backyard that ... could possibly fall on your house then you have the right to have it cut down ... I'm from a country area ... some years ago I had four big silky oaks alongside my parents' place ... ETSA wanted to put up power to my neighbour some 500 metres away ... they put the power line over the fence where my parents lived and they cut down those silky oaks ... if the neighbour's getting the power it should have been on his side of the fence ... really, if you're in a house ... you should have the right to be able to cut that tree down if you think it's going to damage your house in a storm ...*

**Caller Giovanni:** ... *if you've got approval to put in an in ground pool ... that will make a tree closer than 10 metres does that mean the tree is now ... at risk?*

## **Back to Gordon Sykes**

**S:** *Gordon ... how close can it be to a pool?*

**BS:** ... it's all to do with existing dwellings and existing pools. If he has a tree there now and it's one of the species that's protected or it's a regulated tree ... he has to get council approval to build a swimming pool ... most councils will ask how are you going to protect that tree so he can't just chop the tree down prior to putting a swimming pool in, it has to be an existing pool and an existing dwelling ... this new Act and the regulations can be a little unfair to a lot of people wanting to do that just because of a tree.

**Caller Bernie:** ... I've got five trees within three metres of my walls but they are on the roadside ... can I ask them to be removed too.

### **Back to Bob Such**

**S:** Bob Such ...

**BS:** They are not his trees, they're not on his land so they would presumably in his case be in that case owned by the council ... they themselves have to go through a separate process if they want to remove a significant tree or modify a regulated tree ... a lot of people think automatically of removal. A skilled arborist can guide people, tree pruning people to prune a tree, shape it and anything that's dangerous should be removed, whether it's a limb or a tree and a qualified arborist can easily and readily assess that, so people shouldn't have to be in fear of their life or their property because if you get a professional arborist they can tell pretty quickly through a whole lot of techniques whether a tree is sound, whether its limbs are posing a risk, they look at ... buttressing of the limbs, all sorts of things so people shouldn't automatically think of removal ... what we have to do is manage trees in the urban environment, manage them so they contribute to the environment, they are good air conditioners ... they provide shade, they're aesthetic but they don't need to be a risk to anyone.

### **Michelle Lensink, Upper House Liberal MP** (5AA 11.10-11.15) Significant trees

**Pantelis:** *The issue of trees ... significant trees. Let's find out more about this from Michelle Lensink ... who is raising it in Parliament and elsewhere I think. Michelle, good morning ... what's your beef with significant trees?*

**Michelle Lensink:** Oh well look it's not so much a beef, just to update people that we're trying to work through a compromise with the Government. It's an issue that's been going on for a couple of years now. We've had this issue of using girth sizes to determine which trees are significant or not ... that's changed. The girth size has come down such that a tree which is considered significant, which is over three metres instead of two metres now, you still need an arborist report to remove it; a tree less than two metres requires council approval, but doesn't require the arborist's report ... there's a list of exemptions that we think are wrong, in that they include every eucalypt species ... for instance, you've got a whole lot of Indigenous species to South Australia which we think ought to be looked after, but for instance you've got Tasmania Blue Gums which are notorious for causing troubles, which will be exempt ... we're trying to work through that with the new Development Minister and his office just to try and make sure that we actually get these things right, so we strike the right balance between people being able to remove pest plants or dangerous trees, but also keep those that are really important for habitat and for providing amenity, shade and so forth.

**P:** *Well absolutely ... I'm not by any means a tree hugger ... trees are wonderful, have their place, we need them ... but if a tree is dangerous it should come down ... whether it's a metre wide or*

*ten metres wide, if it's the chance of branches falling on people or it is ill or whatever chop it down.*

**ML:** Well that's right ... the Arborists Association we've worked very closely with them, the Liberal Opposition, as well as TreeNet, Bob Such – he's been very active ... I've had meetings with him ... he's very deeply involved in this as well .... it's fell through the cracks ... excuse the pun, in terms of what happened with the regulations because we had a change of Minister and the Government suddenly realised it needed to put the regulations in ... there's still flaws in them ... we're trying very hard to strike the right balance, but anybody who's got an interest in this I've got a Facebook page that will keep them up to date on that, which is called 'Adelaide Trees' ... we're going to seek a meeting with the Minister ... try and come up with a compromise that actually meets the objectives because what the Government have published and what's in force at the moment is actually a bit all over the place.

**P:** ... *I know Dennis Hood had I think introduced the legislation, bringing in these changes and it had been passed, but just needed the Minister's signature to come into force.*

**ML:** Yes, well Dennis was concerned I think with the side of it where people couldn't get trees removed because they need an arborist report and so forth ... he was probably more concerned about the danger aspect ... I think there's two very ... significant sides of the debate ... there's the shade and amenity and habitat value and then there's also the public safety and danger ... we can strike it right, but it's a question of actually speaking to the experts, which is why the arborists are so important, to have them involved in the process.

**P:** *Michelle, are you confident councils move quickly enough on trees ... the reason I raise that is I saw on one of the TV news services over the Christmas break ... where a truck had hit a tree branch out in the north eastern suburbs, somewhere around Glynde I think ... the branch crashed to the ground, it was a large gum ... branches have since been cut back, but it comes after local residents had been telling the council for some time, best part of a year at least, that the tree was dangerous.*

**ML:** Well I think councils vary a lot ... that's part of the problem too ... they've had a pretty strict set of rules that they've had to operate ... some councils do things better than others ... it varies across the metropolitan area ... you'll find some that are very on top of what their trees are and which ones are dangerous and which ones are important and which ones aren't and others where they probably do put it ... a little bit in the too hard basket ... we're hoping to make sure that the rules, the new regulations will be as simple as possible so that it doesn't actually make it more difficult for councils and indeed the homeowners to understand what the rules are.

**P:** ... *Michelle, thank you ...*

**Glen Williams, National Heritage Manager, National Trust** (5AA 11.15-11.19) Significant trees

**Pantelis:** *Glen Williams has called in ...*

**Glen Williams:** ...I applaud the work that Michelle's attempted to do for us really in terms of trying to sort out, or at least have the new regulations ... implemented and interpreted in the best possible way. From the National Trust point of view ... we've been committed and very passionate about the conservation of heritage trees or special merit trees since generating a register of trees back in 1983 very similar to the model that Victoria developed a couple of years earlier than that. The Trust position basically is that we're happy to work with Government and

... any of the other agencies to help improve the interpretation and implementation of the regulators but we're certainly not wanting to encourage or frustrate ... issues of risk management, the sorts of illustrations that you pointed out already clearly need to be resolved and dealt with as expediently as possible. What we don't want, though, is for the regulations to be interpreted in such a way that it makes it very convenient to remove or destroy special merit trees if in fact that they deserve to be investigated a little more thoroughly before it's just a simple issue of risk management ... that's one of the issues obviously attached to the regulations.

**P:**...*fair point: are you satisfied there are enough safeguards?*

**GW:** The short answer is no, not in terms of the regulations, I think they're a bit thin ... not so much in terms of logistics or how they might be managed but in terms that there seems to be a bit of a gap in terms of underlying principles which help certainly Local Government staff who administer the regulations under the Development Act ... there needs to be some guide to help them purely other than just statistics or measurements ... there's a whole range of criteria that the Trust has used to determine what makes a tree special ... from a heritage perspective and that's basically generally absent ... on the legislation and from the regulations.

**P:**...*that tragedy out at Burnside a couple of years ago where a young woman was driving in her car, a branch just fell on her. She was driving down ... Greenhill Road, that shouldn't happen ... I guess you can't go around and cut down every gum tree but at least if they're in a park off the road you kind of wander under them at your own peril, whereas if they're on a road you have no choice and ... the randomness of it is a bit frightening.*

**GW:** ...the challenges are there for any of the authorities that manage or regulate those kind of things. What's important is not to confuse the issue about special merit trees and/or how you manage trees particularly on public lands and all those kind of things so it's very easy to polarise the debate ... I know for a long, long time trees have been the source of many tensions on both sides of the coin but I think it's important not to polarise the issue by looking at risk management issues ... also how you interpret the value of those trees which deserve a place not only now, those wonderful ... aged trees or those trees that are very special, that have a grandeur or particular aesthetic appeal but of course there needs to be a whole range of age range trees, there's going to be trees down the track that will be special trees but of course they're only seedlings or saplings now. You think of all the street tree plantings that happen throughout urban Adelaide and so on and other townships.

**P:** ...*interesting and there are severe penalties too, as I understand it, if you chop down a significant tree or damage one*

**GW:** believe that to be the case, as to how that might be implemented, that will be put to the test I guess in due course.

**P:***All right ... thanks for calling in ...*

# Wednesday 18/1/12

---

**Tim Kelly, CEO, Conservation SA** (Radio Adelaide 7.52-7.59) Regulated trees / Council / Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan / State Government's review of SA's climate change legislation

**Brunero:** *Tim Kelly is the Boss of Conservation SA and he joins us every fortnight but this is the first time this year, welcome Tim ... you've got to solve this mystery for us ... what is a regulated tree?*

**Tim Kelly:** Yeah well this issue's been getting quite a lot of interest from our stakeholders and members ... a regulated tree is kind of like a new subset of significant trees and these are trees which are between two metres and three metres circumference measured at one metre above the ground. In the Adelaide metropolitan area significant trees have been protected ... what's happened is a couple of years ago there was some changes to the Development Act, which said we'll create this new class of regulated trees, so if you're tree's between two metres and three metres, will make it faster and easier for tree damaging activity to occur for developmental clearances and things like that.

**B:** *... so when you say circumference ... that is like taking a tape measure around the belly of the tree, down the bottom?*

**TK:** Yeah ...

**B:** *And what you're saying is it's now easier to cut down those trees?*

**TK:** Yeah, yeah, it's been made easier for development activities to occur or for landholders to remove the trees if they wish.

**B:** *Oh okay, so who's done that, the State Government?*

**TK:** Uh, the State Government has done that, the regulations were delayed for a while but they came into force late last year but now this Development Plan Amendment is designed to put it into local council plans, so some changes have to occur so that councils can give approval for these regulated trees to be removed.

**B:** *Okay, it's all a bit complex. So if you are not happy with this, what do you do ... it's already law?*

**TK:** Uh well, it's already law but it's actually not enforced with the councils, so the difficulty that councils have ...

**B:** *so the councils are the ones who are going to actually have to make the actual decisions here?*

**TK:** Yeah, they'll have to provide the decisions. Now previously councils have been able to go to experts and say, 'look, somebody says this tree is sick and it's dying, it needs to be removed or it's unsafe' and council have sought expert advice and the experts have said 'well yes' or 'no' and then they've been able to make a decisions. With this new process for regulated trees those technical reports aren't required anymore, so the councils have to try and make this decision without the information that would be used to inform whether they meet the criteria

or not ... does it actually remove some of the safeguards that we've had and that's where our concerns lie ...

**B:** *so it's easier to pass a death sentence on a local tree, that's what you're trying to get to?*

**TK:** Yeah certainly.

**B:** *Okay, what can be done, are you against this, are you for this or what do we do?*

**TK:** Well, we're not against the entire intent of what's happening but we're actually against that there aren't adequate safeguards ... and what we would actually like to see is that the Act enables ... where there's special circumstances, where the council feels that they do need specialist technical advice and they do need expert advice, that that's written into the Development Plan Amendments, so they get that advice before the decision is made. Otherwise the council are guessing at whether trees should be removed or not and that's the last thing that we want to see happening ... ultimately this Significant Trees Legislation is there to protect our significant trees, not to actually service the needs of developers and landholders that want to remove them without good reason.

**B:** *Well you're quite right, of course people do love their trees and ... sometimes it's only when the truck arrives and they start chopping the bits off the top that people realise it's about to go down and by then I suppose it's a little bit late. What if you want more information on this?*

**TK:** Well sure, there's quite a lot happening actually ... tomorrow, on Thursday the 19<sup>th</sup> on the corner of Laver Street and Jordan Street in Mount Barker there's a public rally being organised by Stop Urban Sprawl, so people could go along to that if they live in that area ...

**B:** *hold on, you're going very quickly, Tim. The 19<sup>th</sup> which is tomorrow, Thursday ...*

**TK:** yeah ...

**B:** *at what time?*

**TK:** 11am on the corner of Laver Street and Jordan Street at Mount Barker ... Laver, L-A-V-E-R.

**B:** *... so 11am Thursday if you want to go along to a bit of a rally if you feel strongly on this issue. What about just info?*

**TK:** The public submissions are being accepted by January 25<sup>th</sup> but very importantly, on Wednesday the 15<sup>th</sup> of February the Department of Planning and Local Government is holding a public meeting, that's going to take place at the Mercure Grosvenor Hotel, 125 North Terrace at 7pm. So for those people that are really interested in finding out the technical detail of what this Development Plan Amendment is all about, I really suggest that they go along and have a listen and have a say.

**B:** *Okay ... that is just kind of out the front of the Casino, isn't it?) Yeah ... (Brunero: roughly opposite the Casino.*

**TK:** Yeah, yeah ...

**B:** *so the 15<sup>th</sup> of February, it's a Wednesday so it's about in a month's time, at 7 o'clock at the um, Mercure Grosvenor Hotel ... also public submissions, how do you do that?*

**TK:** Uh there's a website which has got a community information statement which guides people on where to send their submissions, so log onto the Department of Planning and Local

Government and you'll find that information ... but yeah get your submission in by the 25<sup>th</sup> of January.

**B:** *To whom do we submit?*

**TK:** Um uh, it's submitted to – it is the Department of Planning and Local Government, I can't remember the exact details. I will put them up on the Conservation SA website when we get back.

**B:** *Okay fantastic ... you're going to joins is in a couple of weeks time ... what's on the cards for next time?*

**TK:** Yeah look, next time I think it would be really appropriate to give an update on the Murray Darling Basin Plan and why we now feel strongly that the proposed, the Draft Plan is bad for South Australia and bad for the Basin, so I'll be able to go into much more detail on that and the reasons I had before ... also I think perhaps next week or the following week we'd be looking at where the State Government is at with its review of South Australia's Climate Change Legislation and targets.

**B:** *Okay well Tim Kelly, CEO of Conservation SA, thank you so much ...*

**TK:** thank you very much, Tim.

**John Hanlon, Deputy Chief Executive, Planning Department** (891ABC 17.54-17.57) Significant tree legislation

**Smyth:** *If you were with us yesterday we had quite a lengthy discussion with a variety of people about the issue of significant trees. Of course the legislation was changed late last year making it easier to remove certain trees without council approval but it's all under review again with public submissions being taken until next week. We thought we'd check in with the Department of Planning ... because there was a meeting held there today about this very issue involving some concerned parties. John Hanlon ... what sort of feedback did you get this afternoon?*

**John Hanlon:** The feedback on this interim development plan has been very good. People are saying to us that 80% to 90% of this planning is right and we really just need to have a look at a couple of areas ... for example how many metres from your home ... 5m or 10m from your home before you're able to cut down a tree without a development application. So that was really most of it ... it's probably worth me just letting you know that what we've done with this particular legislation is we've had extensive consultation about our significant tree regulations. We have brought in a system now where trees between 2m and 3m, they do not require arborist reports, do not require engineer reports, but they still require development application but a council can't ask you for any of those other reports. You should be able through a streamlined process be able to cut those trees down. If it is within 10m of your home you do not need a development application, you can actually take those trees down. The significant trees ... greater than 3m, they would still require arborists ... engineers reports and the councils would want that

**S:** *There was some discussion today as to whether than 10m should be reduced to 5m*

**JH:** Exactly. Really we're at now the point of people agreeing, yes this does need to be streamlined because the system has been fairly arduous on councils. Individual property owners have had issues. It can be very costly at times ... can be very confusing. We're really getting

down to the point now saying if a person owns a home and land and have a tree right up next to their house and that tree is causing ... structural or safety issues, if it's within 5m or 10m, that's really what we're coming down to, can I be able to remove that tree without having to go through a development application and getting the council to approve it. That's really where we're at and that's what we'll go to public consultation on on the 15<sup>th</sup> of February ... and then the Minister will take all of that into account and all the submissions he's received and make a final decision as to how that legislation will look

**S:** ... thank you

**David Lawry, Director, TreeNet** (891ABC 17.57-17.59) Significant tree legislation

**Smyth:** *David Lawry ... were you pleased with the discussions today?*

**David Lawry:** I was really pleased. I've been in about four ministerial meetings and I generally come out with my tail between my legs. But the group that went in represent the Arborists Association ... Local Government, Bob Such there ... and Michelle Lensink was an apology ... but what we've been discussing over the last few weeks, we felt we got a good hearing. We are certainly debating the 10m. We'd like to see that down to 5m. We don't see there's any need to protect eucalypts generally because there are a number of those that present problems but we are suggesting that councils are able to submit their own lists so that ... the character of Burnside is quite determined by its trees, different than the trees at Largs Bay. But councils will be able to nominate trees ... that they believe need protection. The other major thing we wanted changed was the bushfire regulation where ... in a place like Mount Barker a 20m clearance zone would mean they don't even have to put an application in, we'll just clear all the trees. So we've come up with some workable solutions and I'm optimistic that the Act will be.. as John said, we're 80% there. It never made sense that you said a tree was good if it was big. There's a lot of trees that never reach those sizes that should be considered and saved

**S:** ... thank you for joining us ...

# Thursday 19/1/12

---

## **Anti-development group converges on Mt Barker to protest against tree removal regulations**

An anti-development group will converge on Mount Barker this morning to protest against tree removal regulations. Stop Urban Sprawl says State Government amendments give property owners too much power to remove significant trees.

**Stop Urban Sprawl group's Ian Grosser** says tree preservation is an important cause. He says they need support to change the regulation:

*(5AA 6.30am/9am) "The major trees in the hills towns are one of the most attractive aspects of living there, of the environment, they're important for biodiversity, and without protection we feel that a lot of these trees over time will go."*

*(5AA 7.30am) "We're calling on people to write submissions because it's not only a Mount Barker issue, but it's throughout all of the metro areas in Adelaide and they can get more information from our website [www.stopurbansprawl.net](http://www.stopurbansprawl.net)*