6. APPLICATIONS

In this final section the application of the findings of the study to the Barossa Study Region are discussed. It commences by examining the landscape unit ratings and proposing alternative rankings. The measurement of scenic quality in the Study Region using the models that were derived is then described. Thirdly recommendations covering the future planning, development and management of the Barossa Study Region are provided.

6.1 REGIONAL SCENIC QUALITY RATINGS

The mapping in the previous section produced ratings for each landscape unit from a low of 5.0 to a high of 6.5, a range of only 1.5 units. There may be concern, firstly that the scenic quality rating is apparently only middle ranking, and secondly that the range is relatively narrow.

The ratings derived from the Barossa Study Region were as expected based on knowledge gained of previous surveys of landscape quality in South Australia.

The author has previously mapped the landscape quality of South Australia based on a similar methodology. The entire agricultural region rated in the 4’s, because it comprises essentially flat land forms with similar monocultures of cereals and/or pasture and few trees. The Mt Lofty Ranges were a little higher in the 5 – 6 range. The highest rating areas were parts of the coast, particularly where high cliffs are present, and parts of the Flinders Ranges – Wilpena Pound and Aroona Valley. These scored in the 7 and 8 range. The lowest rating areas were the flat featureless gibber plains in the far north which rated in the 3s.

Thus the ratings of 5 to 6 for the Barossa Study Region accord with this pattern. The key features that yield high scenic quality are the presence of water (e.g. rivers or coastal scenes with the sea), steep high land forms, trees, and a natural appearance. The Barossa region has elements of these but not all.

The range of 1.5 units from 5 to 6.5 also fit this pattern. There are no outstanding rugged landscapes in the region which appear essentially natural and so the range is relatively narrow.

Another way of looking at the ratings are to inverse them and to assign them relative rankings. Using this approach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On this basis the rankings of the landscape units would be as shown in table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Unit</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Barossa Valley</td>
<td>5.25 – 5.50</td>
<td>5 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Barossa Ranges</td>
<td>5.25 – 6.50</td>
<td>1 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. North Para River</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. North Para R. valley</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sandy Creek</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Freeling Plains</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gomersal</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Seppeltsfield</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. North Greenock</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Light – Truro</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Moculta</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Collingrove</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kaiserstuhl</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Eden Valley</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This ranking is shown on Map 9. Thus the Barossa Ranges and North Para River are top (or first) ranking areas, the Eden Valley is middle ranking, the viticulture areas of the Barossa Valley – Seppeltsfield and North Greenock are lower middle ranking, and the plains and open areas of the Freeling plains, Gomersal and the northern Light – Truro area are low ranking.
6.2 APPLICATION OF PREDICTIVE MODELS

The models that were derived in Section 5 using multiple regression analysis may be used to predict the likely scenic rating of other scenes in the Study Region. The model with the highest predictive capacity was the following:

\[ Y = 3.038 + 0.411 \text{Trees} + 0.386 \text{Water} + 0.250 \text{Terrain} + 0.146 \text{Vines} + 0.049 \text{Natural} - 0.089 \text{Building} \]

This model used all seven factors and had an \( R^2 \) of 0.486, i.e. it explained nearly 50% of the variance in ratings. A simpler model with only four factors and a similar \( R^2 \) of 0.463 was:

\[ Y = 3.123 + 0.422 \text{Trees} + 0.377 \text{Water} + 0.267 \text{Terrain} + 0.150 \text{Vines} \]

The simplest model used only one factor, trees, but had an \( R^2 \) of only 0.354:

\[ Y = 4.417 + 0.395 \text{Trees} \]

These models may be applied in the Barossa Study Region by scoring the factors on a scale of 1 – 5 and entering the results into the equation. In addition, models were derived for five of the landscape units: Barossa Valley (\( R^2 = 0.42 \)), Gomersal (\( R^2 = 0.65 \)), Seppeltsfield (\( R^2 = 0.96 \)), Collingrove (\( R^2 = 0.80 \)) and Eden Valley (\( R^2 = 0.82 \)). The high correlation coefficient for several of these indicates the results should be credible.

Use of the models involves scoring each of the factors and applying them to the model. The key to the accuracy of the results is consistency in the scoring of the factors. The factors were scored on the basis of the significance of the factor in the scene.

The following steps are involved in applying the models.

1. Identify scene to be assessed

Use a camera with a 50 mm lens (digital equivalent is 35 mm) to frame the scene. It is necessary to confine the scene in this way as the models were derived using photographs of 50 mm. Aim for scenes that are simple, with a dominant theme, e.g. vines with trees and the Barossa Ranges in the background.

2. Score the factors

The seven factors to be scored are: vines, trees, visibility of the Barossa Ranges, water, terrain, naturalness, and buildings & structures. Each are to be scored on a 1 – 5 scale (low – high) based on the relative significance of the feature in the scene. Ideally have at least a dozen people do the scoring and average the results. This will help avoid biases dominating the scores if only one score is used.

Figure 6.1 Progressive derivation of the Mean for a Scene

Figure 6.1 illustrates the importance of having more than one person carry out the scoring. It shows the progressive average for a scene actually scored by 18 persons. Person 1 gave a score of 2, the second person scored 5 so the mean after two scorings was 3.5. Subsequent scorings gradually flatten the oscillations until the final mean of 2.44 was reached. However if the early few scores were adopted, the mean would have been very different. After about a dozen scorings the figure tends to stabilize.

In all the scores, a score of 1 denotes the absence of the feature. As far as possible, the scenes used to illustrate the scoring are from the survey and use the scorings derived. Their actual score is included in parentheses.

3. Score each land use

The following scenes provide a basis for the scoring of each land use in the Barossa Study Region.

The figures in parentheses indicate their actual scores; scenes with scores closest to the integers were used.
Vines are ubiquitous in the Barossa Study Region and are relatively easy to score.

Scene 9 Score 2 (1.95)

8 Score 3 (3.00)

140 Score 4 (3.89)

43 Score 5 (4.79)

The scoring of trees reflects their abundance, size and distribution in the scene.

62 Score 2 (2.00)

112 Score 3 (3.00)

15 Score 4 (4.06)

82 Score 5 (4.83)
Visibility of the Barossa Ranges

This factor is obviously only relevant west of the Ranges. It reflects the relative significance of the Ranges as a backdrop to the scene.

92 Score 2 (2.00)

35 Score 3 (3.00)

48 Score 4 (4.00)

98 Probable score 4.5, no score 5's

Terrain

Terrain was scored ignoring the presence of the Barossa Ranges in the background. It only scored the terrain in the remainder of the scene.

14 Score 2 (2.00)

13 Score 3 (3.00)

143 Score 4 (4.00)

There were no score 5s in the Study Region.
Water

Water is a very important element in the landscape and it takes very little of it to be seen by the eye. Water almost always enhances scenic quality ratings. It is mainly found in dams but is relatively rare in scenes.

**Score 2 (2.00)**

**Probable score 3**

**Score 4 (4.00)**

**Probable score 5**

Naturalness

The assessment of naturalness requires careful analysis of the scene. It is concerned with perceived naturalness, not ecological naturalness. A botanist viewing a scene may see only its lack of full vegetation strata, the lack of certain species, and the degraded condition of the vegetation. However an average person without specialist knowledge would judge it simply on how natural it appears.

Cues such as grazing trails, lack of native trees, roads, powerlines and other infrastructure, farm dams and fences, stock, vines, pines and other land uses all are signs of human presence. Score 1 is the absence of naturalness, 5 is very high.

**Pastoral scene Naturalness score 3.78**

Pastoral landscapes of the type found east of the Barossa Ranges are perceived as highly natural, scoring in the high 3s providing they have pasture. If the areas are grazed bare their score drops to the 2s.
close they were to the photographer. Thus nearby buildings were scored > 3 and more distant buildings were scored < 3.

The nature of the buildings and structures and their impact on scenic quality, were reflected in the scenic quality rating of the scene, churches and ruins rating high while industrial buildings rated low.

These points are illustrated by the two scenes, 4 and 10. In scene 4 the shed is dominant and scored high and its nature was reflected in the low rating. In scene 10, the church scored low but its presence enhanced the rating of the scene.

In providing a guide for the scoring of buildings and structures it is important to recognise that the scoring only reflects their relative dominance or significance in the scene, not their contribution to scenic quality.

**Buildings and Structures**

The scoring of the significance of buildings and structures reflected their dominance in the scene which was largely a function of how
4. Apply Scores to Predictive Model

Having scored the relevant factors the next step involves inserting these into the model to derive the scenic quality rating.

These models are as follows.

**Barossa Study Region**

\[ Y = 2.795 + 0.430 \text{ Natural} + 0.265 \text{ Water} + 0.259 \text{ Trees} + 0.172 \text{ Vines} + 0.106 \text{ Terrain} + 0.076 \text{ Barossa Ranges} - 0.013 \text{ Building} \]

Alternative:

\[ Y = 3.224 + 0.545 \text{ Natural} + 0.217 \text{ Trees} + 0.165 \text{ Vines} \]

**Barossa Valley**

\[ Y = 6.443 + 0.679 \text{ Water} - 0.124 \text{ Trees} - 0.396 \text{ Terrain} - 0.045 \text{ Vines} - 0.141 \text{ Barossa Ranges} - 0.013 \text{ Natural} - 0.417 \text{ Building} \]

**Gomersal**

\[ Y = 1.7 + 0.023 \text{ Terrain} + 2.015 \text{ Natural} + 0.151 \text{ Vines} + 0.0129 \text{ Buildings} - 0.125 \text{ Barossa Ranges} - 0.146 \text{ Trees} \]

**Seppeltsfield**
STRATEGIC MEASURES

Recommendation 1

The Barossa and Light Councils and Planning SA adopt as a key strategic objective the protection, maintenance and enhancement of the Barossa Region’s landscape character and quality covering all aspects of the Region’s planning, development and management.

Underlying all that follows it is vital that the significant role that scenic quality plays in the well being of the region be acknowledged and adopted as policy. Scenic quality was shown by the *Wine Industry Impact Report* (2004) to be a key factor in the Region’s attractiveness for tourism.

Loss or degradation of its scenic quality could have a major deleterious impact with significant economic consequences. Alternatively, maintaining and enhancing its scenic quality could pay dividends in terms of the Barossa region’s tourism attractiveness and identity as a significant region in Australia.

It is proposed that the recommendation be adopted as policy by Planning SA, the Barossa & Light Regional Development Board and the Barossa and Light Councils.

Recommendation 2

Protect the landscape character and quality of the core viticulture area of the Barossa Region from further significant structures and buildings and locate future significant structures and buildings outside of the core viticulture area.

The core viticulture area refers to the Barossa Valley (LU1) south of the Sturt Highway and includes the Rowland Flat and Lyndoch areas, Seppeltsfield and North Greenock areas. This area is absolutely fundamental to the image and attraction of the region. Much of it comprises a flat treeless plain making the screening of large winery structures and tanks difficult.

Further development of this area for large scale wine production and bottling would gradually impose an industrial character on the area which would significantly mar its attractiveness. Based on the comments of some participants (Sec 4.5), there is a perception that this has already occurred to some extent.

6.3 APPLICATION TO PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT

Based on the findings of the Project a number of recommendations are made relating to the on-going planning, development and management of the Barossa Study Region. The significance of the Region, both in South Australia and Australia as a whole is acknowledged and it is essential that any recommendation contributes to the betterment and further enhancement of the region.

Therefore the following recommendations and explanations are provided under the following headings:

- Strategic Measures
- Planning Measures
- Management Measures

---

Y = 0.657 + 0.864 Trees + 0.546 Terrain + 0.251 Barossa Ranges + 0.37 Vines + 0.016 Natural – 0.045 Buildings

Collingrove

Y = 0.287 + 0.736 Trees + 0.489 Water + 0.381 Natural + 0.332 Vines + 0.259 Terrain

Eden Valley

Y = 0.961 + 0.57 Natural + 0.563 Trees + 0.495 Vines + 0.186 Water + 0.148 Building + 0.004 Terrain

If many scenes are involved, the relevant equation can be placed on a spreadsheet and the ratings derived.

Example: Seppeltsfield scene (hypothetical)

Model: $Y = 0.657 + 0.864 \text{ Trees} + 0.546 \text{ Terrain} + 0.251 \text{ Barossa Ranges} + 0.37 \text{ Vines} + 0.016 \text{ Natural} – 0.045 \text{ Buildings}$

Scores (hypothetical): trees = 2.5, terrain 1.5, Barossa Ranges 1.4, Vines 3.5, Natural 1.8, Buildings 1

Therefore: $Y = 0.657 + 0.864 (2.5) + 0.546 (1.5) + 0.251 (1.4) + 0.37 (3.5) + 0.016 (1.8) – 0.045 (1)$

$Y$ (i.e. scenic quality) = 5.27

© Dr Andrew Lothian, Scenic Solutions
“In any area other than the Barossa, the large, often 24/7 (and thus often floodlit at night) winery operations that characterize the intensive industry that is modern winemaking would be called what they are - factories. No-one likes factories in their backyard.” (Participant comment)

These large developments are of such a scale that screening by trees, painting and other measures are plainly inadequate. In future they should not be located in the core viticulture area.

Strategically, such future large operations and structures should be located in suitable areas outside of the core area where they will have less visual impact. The area north of the Sturt Highway between Nuriootpa and Truro would appear to be suitable, given its flatness, lack of viticulture, extensive tree cover and large open paddocks suitable for major developments, and proximity to the main transport artery.

Given the growing pressure from the wine industry to locate major facilities in the Barossa Valley, suitable areas should be identified as a matter of urgency and the viticulture area protected from further major developments.

These photographs are examples of major industrial-type developments located in the viticulture area of the Barossa region.

PLANNING MEASURES

Recommendation 3

Ensure the provisions of the Region’s Development Plan contribute to and do not detract from the protection, management and enhancement of the region’s landscape character and quality.

The Development Plan has not necessarily considered scenic quality adequately in its provisions. It is essential that its provisions
further the protection, management and enhancement of the region’s scenic quality and do not, by default or ignorance, result in its degradation.

**Recommendation 4**

*Ensure that provisions are included in the Development Plan in respect of new developments to safeguard the character and quality of the Barossa region’s landscape.*

“Barossa needs to preserve landscape. An emerging problem seems to be the poor control on the erection of sheds with inappropriate dimensions and colourbond colours.” (Participant comment)

There are many examples of winery developments in the Barossa region which commenced as small operations and have grown to major enterprises. Unfortunately many of these have imposed large scale industrial operations in the heart of the Barossa. The lesson from this is to ensure that the region’s scenic quality is fully considered in respect of the requirements of future developments.

“I prefer low level development, rather than anything that unduly interrupts the natural view. Silos etc. were less noticeable if in a dull green colourbond-type colour rather than the usual zinc” (Participant comment)

**Recommendation 5**

*Appoint a landscape architect to advise councils on planning, development and management issues across the Barossa region.*

If the Barossa & Light Development Board and the Barossa and Light Councils are serious in seeking to improve the landscape quality of the region it needs to have ongoing access to advice from a professional landscape architect.

**Recommendation 6**

*Ensure that the western escarpment of the Barossa Ranges, from near Williamstown to near Stockwell, be given special recognition in the region’s Development Plan and that its landscape character and quality be accorded stringent protection.*

“The Barossa Ranges make a beautiful backdrop and need to be kept free of development-- both built and agricultural.” (Participant comment)

Overlooking Adelaide, the Hills Face Zone has been protected for many years and has maintained the high quality natural landscape as a backdrop to the city.

The Barossa Ranges plays a key role in providing a natural backdrop to the region and should be accorded similar protection from housing development and other inappropriate developments.

**Recommendation 7**

*Prepare, in conjunction with industry and the community, a landscape management plan for the Barossa region to identify detailed measures to protect, manage and enhance its landscape character and quality.*

“The attractions for me in the Barossa Valley are the fields of vines, the historical ruins, the fields of coloured flowers, the townships with coffee shops, antiques shops. The landscapes do not have high rise buildings - just fields of greenery...” (Participant comment)

Measures to address eyesores, enhance the appearance of vineyards and winery buildings together with major planting programs should be considered as elements in an overall plan to enhance the region’s scenic quality.

Development of such a plan, with community input and discussion, would help to focus attention of public and private interests in the well being of the Barossa landscape and provide the impetus for action.

**MANAGEMENT MEASURES**

**Recommendation 8**

*The Barossa and Light Councils work cooperatively with industry, land owners and the community to improve the appearance of properties and encourage the removal of features which degrade scenic quality.*

There are a range of features across the region which detracts from its scenic quality. These include car dumps, transport depots and quarries. Obviously voluntary measures to
improve these should be encouraged but failing these, some form of regulatory measure such as land management agreements under the Development Act may be required.

**Recommendation 9**

*In addressing features which degrade scenic quality, adopt a strategy of removal, relocation and reduction in that order.*

Removal would involve complete cessation of the offending eyesore, whereas relocation would involve moving it to a less sensitive location. Reduction would not involve moving it but rather reducing the impact on scenic quality *in situ.*

10/85 Though screened on some sides, the Rowland Flat winery tanks are visible from the Barossa Ranges

9/24 Environmental, health and landscape benefits would result from the removal of this farm dump.

In some situations, removal or relocation of the offending activity is the best strategy as any amount of screening would not overcome the problem. This is particularly the case where a site may be overlooked by higher land or is located in undulating terrain where it may be viewed from a number of locations. Relocation to a less sensitive location may be a practical alternative.

If this course of action is infeasible, then reduction of visual impact should be tackled as the measure of last resort.

**Recommendation 10**

*Minimise the visual impact of buildings and structures through appropriate means.*

“*It would be good to encourage property owners to plant screening trees around buildings that should be pre-coloured and trees or shrubs be selected to grow to the height of the buildings. This should be a condition of approval and for a landscaping plan to be required.*

(Participant comment)

10/134 Trees soften the form and visual impact of large structures

Trees can screen large tanks and sheds
7 Trees soften and make more attractive the entrance to the winery’s visitor centre

6 This is the same winery as 7 but without any tree cover although some have been planted

10/157 Rowland Flat winery structures should be screened from view on this important tourist route

11.22 Tanks adjacent to Chateau Tanunda. Located on a hilltop without screening or painting.

2/275 Some objects are too large to screen and in the right agricultural environment do not look out of place

8/42 Unscreened quarry. Most of these quarries near Angaston are screened.

The colour (i.e. hue) used to reduce the visual impact of structures is less important than its tonal value. A new galvanized iron shed contrasts vividly against a darker background.

---

1. The tonal value refers to the light – dark continuum and may be approximated by viewing the scene through half closed eyes. This reduces colours and renders the scene in tones of bright through to dark. A black and white photograph can also show the relative tonal values of different surfaces.
2/230 Many sheds like this stand out in the landscape. Painted a darker tone would help them blend in. Screening with plantings would further reduce its impact.

As the background hue changes with seasons, painting the shed green is not the only solution. Rather, painting it a tone of similar tonal quality as a dark green or brown will achieve the reduced visual impact that is sought.

11 Yalumba winery – the light tonal quality of the walls complements the tone of the soil.

4/14 The darker sides and roof hide these sheds. The ends should also be painted a dark tone.

71 The darker tonal quality of old buildings helps them to fit into the landscape.

9/15 An operating quarry is obviously difficult to screen but should be worked to minimize its impact after closure through land forming to fit the contours, replacement of topsoil to allow agricultural use, and tree planting.

95 Green painted tanks. A brown of a similar or darker tonal value could also be used.

1/87 This green shed has a suitable tonal value.
9/35 Powerlines obviously cannot be hidden but their routes should be selected to minimize their visual impact.

**Recommendation 11**

**Green the Barossa**

“A blend of trees/farming and vineyards is more attractive than acre upon acre of pure vineyard.” (Participant comment)

For region-wide scenic quality enhancement the single key action needed is to establish tree cover on a large scale.

Greening the Barossa should be a key strategic objective, not only for its benefits for biodiversity, water and land management but also because trees represent the most effective means of enhancing scenic quality.

The need for this was reinforced by comments of many participants in the survey (Sec 4.5). The predictive models developed (Sec 4.10) indicated the significance of trees along with naturalness. Trees convey an image of naturalness which is the most important attribute of high scenic quality. Thus trees provide a means of creating an impression of naturalness.

“I loved the open country scenes, with the rich brown/red dirt, the strong gums, trees reaching into a lovely blue sky. I wasn't so keen on the open flat dry land, with no trees, no plants, no life.” (Participant comment)

Plantings of trees should include the shrub and ground vegetation strata as these will help convey a more natural appearance than trees alone and additionally provide greater biodiversity benefits. Ideally, trees indigenous to the area should be selected as these suit its climate and soils.

Planting may be established along roadsides and in public areas such as parks. As well private land owners and winery operators should be encouraged to establish tree cover. Many are already doing so.

Natural regeneration of remnant trees can be encouraged through fencing off small areas to exclude stock and by controlling weed growth which can smother seedlings. The Flaxman and Eden Valleys require action now to establish new tree growth as otherwise these areas could become quite barren in coming years and their scenic quality will decline.

**Recommendation 12**

**Encourage the viticulture and agriculture industries in the Barossa region to utilise professional advice from landscape architects regarding measures to improve the visual appearance of their operations, developments and infrastructure.**

“The Barossa is a region that you expect to see vineyards and the results of years of heavy agriculture. To market the place you have to also show that there are still areas of pristine beauty, to give reasons other than wine to visit.” (Participant comment)

Most of the vineyards are planted in straight rows but where they have been curved to fit the contours the result is visually pleasing.

140 Seppeltsfield vineyards curved to follow the contour

Shelterbelts of trees, location of dams on the property, routing of access tracks, location of buildings and structures and their landscape treatment could all be improved with advice from a landscape architect.

**6.4 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

The regional scenic quality ratings for the Study Region were shown as rankings, from 1
for the highest through to 7 for the lowest, with spaces of 0.25 rating for each.

The predictive models may be used to determine the scenic rating of scenes in the Study Region and comprehensive guidelines were provided to assist in this.

Recommendations were made relating to the planning, development and management of the Barossa Study Region:

STRATEGIC MEASURES

Recommendation 1

The Barossa and Light Councils and Planning SA adopt as a key strategic objective the protection, maintenance and enhancement of the Barossa Region’s landscape character and quality covering all aspects of the Region’s planning, development and management.

Recommendation 2

Protect the landscape character and quality of the core viticulture area of the Barossa Region from further significant structures and buildings and locate future significant structures and buildings outside of the core viticulture area.

PLANNING MEASURES

Recommendation 3

Ensure the provisions of the Region’s Development Plan contribute to and do not detract from the protection, management and enhancement of the region’s landscape character and quality.

Recommendation 4

Ensure that provisions are included in the Development Plan in respect of new developments to safeguard the character and quality of the Barossa region’s landscape.

Recommendation 5

Appoint a landscape architect to advise councils on planning, development and management issues across the Barossa region.

Recommendation 6

Ensure that the western escarpment of the Barossa Ranges, from near Williamstown to near Stockwell, be given special recognition in the region’s Development Plan and that its landscape character and quality be accorded stringent protection.

Recommendation 7

Prepare, in conjunction with industry and the community, a landscape management plan for the Barossa region to identify detailed measures to protect, manage and enhance its landscape character and quality.

MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Recommendation 8

The Barossa and Light Councils work cooperatively with industry, land owners and the community to improve the appearance of properties and encourage the removal of features which degrade scenic quality.

Recommendation 9

In addressing features which degrade scenic quality, adopt a strategy of removal, relocation and reduction in that order.

Recommendation 10

Minimise the visual impact of existing buildings and structures through appropriate means.

Recommendation 11

Green the Barossa

Recommendation 12

Encourage the viticulture and agriculture industries in the Barossa region to utilise professional advice from landscape architects regarding measures to improve the visual appearance of their operations, developments and infrastructure.
7. CONCLUSIONS

7.1 PROJECT BRIEF AND OUTCOMES

The Project Brief stated the aim of the Barossa Landscape Assessment Study was to “assess the scenic quality of the Barossa Valley Region rural landscapes outside of townships.” It required a “publicly defendable and repeatable valuation of the scenic quality of the landscapes and landmarks of the area, giving a value to every landscape unit.” The project included both natural and cultural elements e.g. land forms and buildings.

Implicit in the Project Brief was the requirement to map scenic quality for the Study Region.

The Project’s aims and requirements have been fully met.

This Report has comprehensively described the acquisition of the data and its analysis, detailed the mapping of scenic quality, and provided recommendations for the future protection and management of the Barossa Region’s scenic quality.

The Project outcomes were intended to contribute to the setting of “clear strategic directions for the use of land within the Barossa and Light region.” It is considered that the Project has provided a clear and objective basis for the consideration of scenic quality in planning and development assessment.

7.2 SCENIC QUALITY AND THE COMMUNITY

It is to be hoped that this report will provide strong support and encouragement for the greater recognition of scenic quality as a key resource for the Barossa community. This may reinforce the importance of scenic quality as an environmental and community resource that should not be ignored.

Lip service has often been paid to scenic quality, acknowledging its importance for example in tourism promotion and in regional and local planning but failing to do anything significant to objectively identify, measure and map it.

Given that the tourism industry is dependent on attractive landscapes for much of its economic viability, scenic quality comprises an important economic resource and should be managed and protected accordingly.

A century ago it was estimated that Switzerland gained between US$10,000 - 40,000 per square mile from its scenery per year (Runte, 1979).

With 929,000 visitors annually, the worth of tourism to the Barossa region is very considerable. Assuming a conservative figure of $50/day/person expenditure, total expenditure could be in the order of $46 million annually. Based on an area of 841 sq km, this is equivalent of over $55,000/sq km annually or around $150/sq km per day.

The real figures are unknown; it may be half this, but even at $55,000/sq km annually or $150/sq km per day the tourism value of the area is considerable.

Taking action to enhance the scenic quality of the region may add say conservatively 5% per annum to this value. Thus investment in scenic quality enhancement is likely to pay direct and substantial dividends to the Barossa community.

The methodology employed in the study, and the insights it has provided into the underlying factors which generate scenic quality, will, it is hoped, inform and educate planning, environmental and land management professionals and the community generally. It has been shown possible to both measure and map scenic quality objectively and rigorously through a methodology that has produced replicable results.

Scenic quality is a community resource the entire Barossa community owns and for which it is responsible. It is a resource enjoyed by many visitors from elsewhere in South Australia, Australia and overseas. The Barossa community has a responsibility to protect and manage the scenic quality of the region and through its actions will gain the benefits.

---

2. The Bureau of Tourism Research estimated that international visitors spent $82/night in 1999.
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